











HAVERFORD COLLEGE STUDIES

Published by the Faculty of

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

Nos. 6 & 7

Price \$2.

AS 36 H25 V.6-8

CONTENTS.

PAGE

No. 647 The Apology of Aristides. J. Rendel Harris. With an Appendix by J. Armitage Robinson.

No. 8 a study of Codex Bezar J. Rendel Harris

To obtain copies of this publication address the Secretary of Haverford College, Haverford College P. O., Pa.

This number has been republished from the Cambridge Series of "Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature," by permission of the Editor of the Series and with the consent of the Syndics of the University Press.

Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2012 with funding from LYRASIS members and Sloan Foundation

COD . SINAIT . SYR . XVI.

Jaking Thurs مرام عمل برم העול העול אונו recipe the months of ער ברבוח הנצבע אנה לצבחהא דאסמיאין עם ידם אין كية حد مصحم بتهديم بدهنمه لي محصفول revenue mo believe المناسب على المذ فكانس ودمانقادمات دة الم مالمة مدهد תצברה צבו עלהנסאי. erecally livery pasing winders. plies sules pluring. חרולפת בנד הפושי בת שובא הנסמבדעותה murey on man 2 Ar aming חאינים המכנולכם with what clones "comocosas missin minustral mindrouce अन्य न्द्रमान्त्रीतांकाः חבה בנסהא לבא theres it is lained مسرم مقالمات porcury cind m. ودرسوا احتداوه

भवावकेपार ३० स्टोर פניא וכובבאי בוח was early asin moule on hom क्षानिक्षण यह एक्स्पानं שווו אלומלטא איום to certon certo Drubonbio planil المه مديد من مول KONKA KUS Sudame L'y inco entron into micro e. or Latington ye א חובבר ונים חביצים الم مرداد عالم مر alaridas moderas מאוחרובה המכנחם Singles: pecumo בבוכא אומנישה בנא The answals and Kation . aminista لابديم دود عه مناديد. - on workhasta المحسدم حسله مالمنصون محضو too, luceun. H נחפל זהם הנוחהכל Kudosa Kalas Kons Kurkla Kinx diring בהבכיא מני הנחשק אוצי בכושה בא

INTRODUCTION.

THE present volume contains one of the earliest of the Apologies made to the Roman Emperors on behalf of the Christians, that, namely, which was said to have been presented to the Emperor Hadrian by an Athenian philosopher of the name of Aristides. Our information concerning this Apology has hitherto been of the scantiest kind, depending chiefly upon certain allusions of Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History and in his Chronicon; as Eusebius did not, however, preserve any extracts from the book and presents only a most obscure figure in a philosopher's garb as its author, while subsequent writers have added little or nothing to what they found in Eusebius, it must be admitted that our ideas as to the character and scope of one of the earliest apologetic treatises on Christianity were about as vague as it was possible for them to be. It is true that there was a suspicion abroad which came from Jerome that the lost work of Aristides had been imitated by Justin in his Apology, and Jerome had also ventured the opinion that the Apology was woven out of materials derived from the philosophers: but it was almost impossible to put any faith in Jerome's statements, which are usually mere editorial expansions and colourings of what he found in the pages of Eusebius. Not that there was any à priori improbability in the opinion that one Christian Apologist had imitated another, for almost all the Apologies that are known to us are painfully alike, and it would not be difficult to maintain of any two of them selected at random that one of them had borrowed from or imitated the other. The difficulty lay in the want of literary faith in statements made by Jerome; but even if this confidence had not been wanting, we should not have been very much the wiser.

In the case of a companion Apology to that of Aristides, we were more happily placed for forming an opinion; since Eusebius not only describes an Apology presented to the Emperor Hadrian by a certain Quadratus, at the time of one of the imperial visits to Athens, but gives us also some striking and powerful sentences, just enough to convince one that the document was marked by argumentative force and spiritual insight, and could not have been a mere conventional tirade against paganism. Until recent times, then, all that could be said on the subject of these lost Apologies was that we had Eusebian tradition for their existence, Eusebian authority for their date, and a Eusebian extract from one of them as a specimen of sub-apostolic defence, a mere brick from a vanished house.

The mist, however, lifted some time ago, when the learned Armenians of the Lazarist monastery at Venice added to the obligations under which they have so often laid the scholarly and Christian world, by publishing an Armenian translation of the opening chapters of the lost Apology of Aristides; and although their document was received in some quarters with incredulity, it will be seen, by what we have presently to bring forward, that the fragment which they printed was rightly entitled, and that they had at least made the way for a satisfactory conception of

¹ Especially by M. Renan, who in his Origines de Christianisme, vol. vi. p. vi., says: "Le présent volume était imprimé quand j'ai eu connaissance d'une publication des mékhitaristes de Venise contenant en Arménien, avec traduction Latine, deux morceaux, dont l'un serait l'Apologie adressée par Aristide à Adrien. L'authenticité de cette pièce ne soutient pas l'examen. C'est une composition plate, qui répondrait bien mal à ce que Eusèbe et S. Jérome disent du talent de l'auteur et surtout à cette particularité que l'ouvrage était contextum philosophorum sententiis. L'écrit Arménien ne présente pas une seule citation d'auteur profane. La théologie qu'on y trouve, en ce qui concerne la Trinité, l'incarnation, la qualité de mère de Dieu attribuée à Marie, est postérieure au rv° siècle. L'érudition historique ou plutôt mythologique est aussi bien indigne d'un écrivain du m° siècle. Le second 'sermon' publié par les mékhitaristes a encore moins de droit à être attribué au philosophe Chrétien d'Athènes: le manuscrit porte Aristaeus: c'est une homélie insignificable sur le bon larron."

M. Renan was rightly opposed in this sweeping negation of authenticity by Doulcet, who pointed out relations between Aristides and the *Timaeus* as a justification of the philosophical character of the work. Unfortunately Doulcet

the dogmatics which underlay the apologetics. This was a great gain. Moreover their published fragment shewed traces of an interesting originality of method in the classification of the religious beliefs of the time.

Our contribution to the subject consists of a Syriac translation of the whole, or substantially the whole, of the missing Apology. We were so happy as to discover this text in a volume of Syriac extracts preserved in the library of the convent of St Catharine, upon Mount Sinai, during a delightful visit which we paid to those majestic solitudes and silences in the spring of 1889. Our copy has suffered somewhat in the course of time from successive transcriptions, and needs occasionally the hand of the critical corrector. The language and thought of the writer are, however, so simple and straightforward that the limits of error are much narrower than they would be in a document where the structure was more highly complicated; the unintelligible sentences which accumulate in a translation so much more rapidly than in the copying of an original document, are almost entirely absent. In fact the writer is more of a child than a philosopher, a child well-trained in creed and well-practised in ethics, rather than either a dogmatist defending a new system or an iconoclast destroying an old one: but this simplicity of treatment, so far from being a weakness, adds often greatly to the natural impressiveness of the subject and gives the work a place by the side of the best Christian writing of his age. But, before going further, it will be best to describe a little more closely the volume from which our text is taken.

Description of the MS.

The MS. from which we have copied is numbered 16 amongst the Syriac MSS. of the Sinaitic convent. The MS. may be

went too far, by trying to identify Aristides with the author of the Epistle to Diognetus.

Harnack (Theol. LZ. 1879, no. 16, col. 375 f.) was very favourable to the genuineness of the fragment, and made some excellent points in its defence.

M. Renan will now have the opportunity of verifying for himself that the term Theotokos, to which he objected so strongly as savouring of the fourth century, is not in the Syriac text.

referred to the 7th century, and is written in two columns to the page. The book is made up of a number of separate treatises and extracts, almost all of which are ethical in character. Thus on fol. $1\,b$ we have

معصم المعلم المال المحقوم المعلم المعلم المعاون المعا

or, the history of the Lives of the Fathers, translated from Greek into Syriac.

On fol. 2 b

בל נשנון מה הבלחםה מבינולא

Apparently we have here the *Liber Paradisi* or Lives of the Holy Fathers of the Desert, of which many copies exist in Greek, though it may be doubted whether there is any critical edition. Some portions of this Syriac version were published at Upsala by Tullberg and his disciples, in 1851, from MSS. in the Vatican and in the British Museum. In our MS. the current heading of the pages is

سترحه سيسه حميعه

or, History of the Egyptian Hermits. After fol. 86 b two leaves appear to have been cut away. Fol. 87 b bears the heading

سابس صمل حديه

Of the holy Nilus the Solitary.

At the foot of fol. 93 a begins the Apology of Aristides. On fol. 105 a begins

معربه دوه الماده مد دهدار مد هر الماده مد مردده

or, A discourse of Plutarch on the subject of a man's being assisted by his enemy.

At the foot of fol. 112 a

on it is the representation

or, A second discourse of the same Plutarch περὶ ἀσκήσεως.

Apparently this is the tract published by Lagarde in his *Analecta*, pp. 177—186, and translated by Gildemeister and Bücheler.

On fol. 121 b wai has kinks

A discourse of Pythagoras,

probably the same as is published in Lagarde's *Analecta*, pp. 195—201.

On fol. 126 a Khow Li wasiflasi Kioko

A discourse of Plutarch, on Anger, for which see Lagarde, Analecta Syriaca, pp. 186—195.

On fol. 132 b

مود معادی دراه می علد دران المام دران المام الم

A discourse of Lucius (Lucianus), that we should not receive slander against our friends: περὶ τοῦ μὴ ῥαδίως πιστεύειν διαβολῆ.

Apparently the same as is given in Sachau, *Inedita*, pp. 1—16.

On fol. 140 α

אחר באבוא נמים ופיושונה אך הבים

A discourse made by a philosopher, De Anima: probably the same as is given in Sachau, *Inedita*, as Philosophorum de anima sententiae.

On fol. 143 a

antipue or seponente cues en l'ina

or, the Counsel of Theano, a female philosopher of the school of Pythagoras: see Sachau, *Inedita*, pp. 70—75, as Theano: Sententiae¹.

On fol. $145\,b$ a collection of Sayings of the Philosophers, beginning with

i تعدد مراع (Plato the Wise said). On fol. 151 b

مست المه ومعمه ومصاله وحدو الحذر

A first discourse in explanation of Ecclesiastes, made by Mar John the Solitary for the blessed Theognis. See Wright's Cat. of the Syr. MSS. in the Brit. Mus. p. 996.

¹ See Wright's Catalogue, p. 1160. The general contents of this MS. (Brit. Mus. 987) should be compared with those of the MS. here described: it contains e.g. the Apology of Melito and the Hypomnemata of Ambrose, and various Philosophical treatises.

And from fol. 214 a onward the volume is occupied with translations from the Homilies of Chrysostom on Matthew.

The above description will shew something of the value of the MS. It will also suggest that it was the ethical character of the Apology of Aristides that secured its incorporation with the volume. Let us now pass on to discuss the effect which this recovered document has upon our estimate of the Eusebiar statements concerning the earliest Church Apologists.

Aristides and Eusebius.

According to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius we have the following date for the Apologies of Quadratus and Aristides:

- 1. The Armenian version of the Chronicon gives under the year 124 A.D. as follows:
 - Ol. A. Abr. Imp. Rom.
- ^d226 2140 8^e
- Adrianus Eleusinarum rerum gnarus fuit multaque (dona) Atheniensium largitus est.
- Romanorum ecclesiae episcopatum excepit septimus Telesphorus annis XI.

Codratus apostolorum auditor et Aristides nostri dogmatis (nostrae rei) philosophus Atheniensis Adriano supplicationes dedere apologeticas (apologiae, responsionis) ob mandatum. Acceperat tamen et a Serennio (s. Serenno) splendido praeside (iudice) scriptum de Christianis, quod nempe iniquum sit occidere cos solo rumore sine inquisitione, neque ulla accusatione. Scribit Armonicus Fundius (Phundius) proconsuli Asianorum ut sine ullo damno et incusatione non damnarentur; et exemplar edicti eius hucusque circumfertur.

One of the Armenian MSS. (Cod. N) transfers this notice about the Apologists to the following year, and it is believed that this represents more exactly the time of Hadrian's first visit to Athens (125—126 A.D.). With this agrees the dating of the Latin version of Jerome. We may say then that it is the intention of Eusebius to refer the presentation of both these

Apologies to the time when Hadrian was spending his first winter in Athens; and to make them the reason for the Imperial rescript to Minucius Fundanus which we find attached to the first Apology of Justin Martyr. And since Minucius Fundanus and his predecessor Granianus were consuls suffect in the years 106 and 107, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they held the Asian pro-consulate in the years A.D. 123 and 124, or 124 and 125. If then Aristides and Quadratus presented apologies to Hadrian, it is reasonable to connect these Apologies with his first Athenian winter and not with the second (A.D. 129—130).

But here we begin to meet with difficulties; for, in the first place, much doubt has been thrown on the genuineness of the rescript of the emperor to Minucius Fundanus; in the second place there is a suspicious resemblance between Quadratus the Apologist and another Quadratus who was bishop of Athens in the reign of Antoninus Pius, succeeding to Publius whom Jerome affirms to have been martyred; and in the third place our newly-recovered document cannot by any possibility be referred to the period suggested by Eusebius, and there is only the barest possibility of its having been presented to the Emperor Hadrian at all. Let us examine this last point carefully, in order to answer, as far as our means will permit, the question as to the time of presentation of the Apology of Aristides and the person or persons to whom it was addressed.

The Armenian fragment is headed as follows:

To the Emperor Hadrian Caesar, from Aristides, philosopher of Athens.

There is nothing, at first sight, to lead us to believe that this is the original heading; such a summary merely reflects the Eusebian tradition and might be immediately derived from it.

When we turn to the Syriac Version, we find a somewhat similar preface, to the following effect.

Apology made by Aristides the Philosopher before Hadrianus the King, concerning the worship of Almighty God.

But this, which seems to be a mere literary heading, proper, shall we say, for one out of a collection of apologies, is immediately

followed by another introduction which cannot be anything else than a part of the primitive apology. It runs as follows:

...Caesar Titus Hadrianus Antoninus, Worshipful and Clement, from Marcianus Aristides, philosopher of Athens.

The additional information which we derive from this sentence is a sufficient guarantee of its genuineness; we have the first name of the philosopher given, as Marcianus; and we have the name of the emperor addressed given at length. To our astonishment this is not Hadrian, but his successor Antoninus Pius, who bears the name of Hadrian by adoption from Publius Aelius Hadrianus. Unless therefore we can shew that there is an error or a deficiency in the opening sentence of the Apology we shall be obliged to refer it to the time of the emperor Antoninus Pius, and to say that Eusebius has made a mistake in reading the title of the Apology, or has followed some one who had made the mistake before him. And it seems tolerably clear that if an error exist at all in such a precise statement as ours, it must be of the nature of an omission. Let us see what can be urged in favour of this theory. We will imagine that the original title contained the names both of Hadrian and of Antoninus Pius. his adviser and companion, much in the same way as Justin opens his first Apology with the words, "to the Emperor Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Caesar and to his son Verissimus the Philosopher, and to Lucius the Philosopher, natural son of Caesar and adopted son of Pius....I Justin...have written the following appeal and supplication." In support of this theory we might urge the apparent dislocation of the opening sentence of our Apology. The Syriac version is clearly wrong in its punctuation, for example, since it transfers the expression 1 (Almighty) to Caesar, by placing a colon after the word Kalk (God). This is clearly impossible, for that the writer did not attempt to translate, say, αὐτοκράτωρ as if it were παντοκράτωρ will be evident from his correct use of the Divine attribute later on in his work. But even if the translator had been guilty of such a mistake, the case would not have been bettered, because Antonine would now have been styled Emperor as well as Caesar.

But let us imagine if we please that the term Caesar or

Emperor Caesar belongs to a previous name which has dropped out and supply the connective necessary, so as to read, "To the Emperor Aelius Hadrianus Augustus Caesar and to Titus Hadrianus Antoninus." In support of this we may urge that the adjectives which follow are marked in the Syriac with the sign of the plural, as if the writer imagined himself to be addressing more persons than one. Supposing then that this is the case we should still have to face the question as to the name given to Antonine; if he is called Hadrian, this must mean that the Apology is presented at some time subsequent to his adoption, which is generally understood to have taken place in the year A.D. 138, only a little while before Hadrian's death. So that in any case we should be prohibited by our document from dating the Apology in question either in the first visit of Hadrian to Athens or in the second visit, and we should only have the barest possibility that it was presented to Hadrian at all. It would have, so to speak, to be read to him on his death-bed at Baiae. Seeing then the extreme difficulty of maintaining the Hadrianic or Eusebian hypothesis, we are driven to refer the Apology to the reign of Antoninus Pius, and to affirm that Eusebius made a mistake in reading or quoting the title of the book, in which mistake he has been followed by a host of other and later writers. If he followed a text which had the heading as in the Syriac, he has misunderstood the person spoken of as Hadrian the king; and if on the other hand he takes the opening sentences as his guide, he has made a superficial reference, which a closer reading would have corrected. All that is necessary to make the Syriac MS. intelligible is the introduction of a simple prepositional prefix before the imperial name, and the deletion of the ribbui points in the adjectives.

Nor is this all; for there can be no doubt that the two adjectives in question (∞) are intended to represent two of the final titles of Antoninus: ∞ standing for the Greek $\Sigma \epsilon \beta a \sigma \tau \delta s$, which again is the equivalent of the Latin Augustus; and ∞ being the equivalent of the title Pius which the Roman Senate gave to Antoninus shortly after his accession and which the Greeks render by $\epsilon \vec{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta \vec{\gamma} s$. And it is precisely in this order that the titles are usually found,

viz. Augustus Pius, which the Syriac has treated as adjectives, and connected by a conjunction. Moreover this translation of $\epsilon \vec{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta \acute{\eta} \varsigma$ on the part of the Syriac interpreter shews that the meaning of the title is 'clement' or 'compassionate,' rather than that of mere filial duty, which agrees with what we find in a letter of Marcus Aurelius to Faustina; "haec (clementia) patrem tuum imprimis Pii nomine ornavit¹."

Now how will this conclusion react upon the companion Apology of Quadratus? We could, no doubt, maintain that it leaves the question where it found it. The mistake made by Eusebius need not have been a double error, and the correct reference to Hadrian for Quadratus's Apology would have furnished a starting-point for the incorrect reasoning with regard to Aristides. On this supposition we should simply erase the reference to Aristides from Eusebius and his imitators.

But there is one difficulty to be faced, and that is the fact that we were in confusion over Quadratus before we reached any conclusion about Aristides. And our investigation has not helped to any elucidation of the confusion. Read for example the language in which Eusebius (H. E. IV. 3) describes the presentation of the Apology,

Αἴλιος 'Αδριανὸς διαδέχεται τὴν ἡγεμονίαν' τούτω Κοδράτος λόγον προσφωνήσας ἀναδιδωσιν, ἀπολογίαν συντάξας ὑπὲρ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς θεοσεβείας

and compare it with the Greek of the *Chronicon* as preserved by Syncellus,

Κοδράτος ὁ ἱερὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀκουστὴς Αἰλί φ 'Αδριαν $\hat{\varphi}$ τ $\hat{\varphi}$ αὐτοκράτορι λόγους ἀπολογίας ὑπὲρ Χριστιαν $\hat{\omega}$ ν ἔδωκεν and we naturally suspect with Harnack that the title must have been something like the following,

λόγος ἀπολογίας ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν θεοσεβείας, and we are confirmed in this belief by finding that the Aristides Apology was also headed

ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ τῆς θεοσεβείας

at least its literary heading must have been very like this.

¹ Quoted by Eckhel, *Doctrina* vii. Pt. 11. p. 36. This would seem to resolve the perplexity of Spartianus as to the origin of the name.

² Die griechischen Apologeten p. 101. I need not say how much I am indebted to Harnack's investigations. It will be apparent throughout these pages.

May we not also infer that the opening sentences of the Quadratus-Apology must have contained the dedication $Ai\lambda i\varphi$ ' $A\delta\rho\iota av\hat{\varphi}$ which we find suggested above? But when we have made these suppositions the similarity between the two apologies in the titles is very great, for Aelius Hadrianus is also a part of the adopted name of the emperor Antoninus.

And let us look at the matter from another point of view. One of our early sources of information about Quadratus, the bishop of Athens, is found in a passage of a letter of Dionysius of Corinth preserved by Eusebius, and certainly Dionysius of Corinth ought to be good authority for Athenian religious history of the time immediately preceding his own. Eusebius does not actually quote the letter which Dionysius wrote to the church at Athens, but he tells us its scope and makes it easy to divine its contents: his language is as follows:

ή δὲ (ἐπιστολή) πρὸς ᾿Αθηναίους διεγερτική πίστεως καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιου πολιτείας ἡς ὀλιγωρήσαυτας ἐλέγχει, ὡς ἂυ μικροῦ δεῖν ἀποστάντας τοῦ λόγου, ἐξ οὖπερ τὸν προεστώτα αὐτών Πούπλιον μαρτυρῆσαι κατὰ τοὺς τότε συνέβη διωγμούς. Κοδράτου δὲ μετὰ τὸν μαρτυρήσαντα Πούπλιον καταστάντος αὐτών ἐπισκόπου μέμνηται ἐπιμαρτυρών, ὡς ἂν διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ σπουδῆς ἐπισυναχθέντων, καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἀναζωπύρησιν εἰληχότων.

From this it would naturally be inferred that the Quadratus mentioned in the letter was a contemporary of Dionysius of Corinth; for the latter writes to the Athenians at once convicting them of slackness in the faith, and congratulating them on their happy revival under the ministration of Quadratus. And since Dionysius writes letters also to Soter, the bishop of Rome, who belongs to the early years of Marcus Aurelius, we should probably say that Quadratus was not very much earlier than this, which would place him in the reign of Antoninus Pius. And the persecution at Athens which ended in the martyrdom of Publius must therefore fall in the same reign. Now Jerome (de Virr. ill. § 19) identifies this Quadratus, the bishop of Athens, with the Apologist¹, and consequently pushes back the persecution into the

^{1 &}quot;Quadratus apostolorum discipulus, Publio Athenarum episcopo ob Christi fidem martyrio coronato, in locum eius substituitur et ecclesiam grandi terrore dispersam fide et industria sua congregat. Cumque Hadrianus Athenis exegisset

reign of Hadrian. We do not indeed attach any especial weight to Jerome's statement as to the time of the persecution, which is simply a combination made up out of passages from Eusebius concerning Quadratus and Dionysius with slight amplifications. He can hardly be right in placing the persecution under the reign of Hadrian, for, as Lightfoot points out¹, Eusebius, from whom he draws his facts, knows nothing about it: moreover we have information from Melito² that Antoninus Pius did actually write to Athens to suppress a persecution of the Christians. But, on the other hand, may he not be right after all in his identification of the bishop Quadratus with the Apologist, and do not the circumstances of the persecution suggested by Melito and testified to by Dionysius exactly suit the presentation of the Apology to the emperor?

While then we would readily admit that, as long as the Apology of Aristides was held to belong to the time of an Athenian visit of Hadrian, the Apology of Quadratus naturally remained with it, yet on the other hand when the Hadrian hypothesis is untenable for Aristides, will not the Quadratusbishop and Quadratus-apologist naturally run together, and be one and the same person? Or is there anything to prevent the identification? The words 'apostolorum discipulus,' used by Jerome, and the corresponding words of Eusebius, ἀποστόλων άκουστής, can hardly be held to militate seriously against this hypothesis, for they are evident deductions from the passage which Eusebius quotes from the Apology of Quadratus about the sick people healed by the Lord, 'some of whom continued down to our times.' Jerome says boldly that Quadratus had seen very many of the subjects of our Lord's miracles; which is in any case a gross exaggeration. But if such persons, either many or few, had really lived into the age of Quadratus, it would be very difficult to place

hiemem, invisens Eleusinam, et omnibus paene Graeciae sacris initiatus dedisset occasionem his, qui Christianos oderant, absque praecepto imperatoris vexare credentes, porrexit ei librum &c."

¹ Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, ed. ii. 11, 541.

² Euseb. H. E. Iv. 26, ex apologia Melitonis, \dot{o} δὲ πατήρ σου καὶ σοῦ τὰ σύμπαντα διοικοῦντος αὐτῷ, ταῖς πόλεσι περὶ τοῦ μηδὲν νεωτερίζειν περὶ ἡμῶν ἔγραψεν ἐν οἶς καὶ πρὸς Λαρισσαίους καὶ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς καὶ ᾿Αθηναίους καὶ πρὸς πάντας Έλληνας. This certainly looks like an outbreak of persecution in Greece.

the Apologist in the reign of Antoninus Pius. Unless, therefore, it can be maintained that the language quoted by Eusebius from Quadratus is an exaggeration or a misunderstanding we can hardly identify the bishop with the apologist. This is the furthest point to which the evidence carries the argument.

And now let us return to Aristides and see whether we can determine anything further concerning the time and manner of presentation of the Apology.

And first of all we may say that the simplicity of the style of the Apology is in favour of an early date. The religious ideas and practices are of an antique cast. The ethics shew a remarkable continuity with Jewish ethics: the care for the stranger and the friendless, the burial of the dead and the like, are given as characteristic virtues both of Judaism and of Christianity. Indeed we may say that one of the surprising things about the Apology is the friendly tone in which the Jews are spoken of: one certainly would not suspect that the chasm between the Church and the Synagogue had become as practically impassable as we find it in the middle of the second century. There is no sign of the hostile tone which we find towards the Jews in the martyrdom of Polycarp, and nothing like the severity of contempt which we find in the Epistle to Diognetus. If the Church is not in the writer's time any longer under the wing of the Synagogue, it has apparently no objection to taking the Synagogue occasionally under its own wing.

Such a consideration seems to be a mark of antiquity, and one would, therefore, prefer to believe, if it were possible, that the Apology was earlier than the Jewish revolt under Bar-Cochab. But since we have shewn that view to be untenable (and yet how attractive if we could place Aristides in the second visit of Hadrian to Athens, and Quadratus in the first!) we must content ourselves with seeking as early a date as is consistent with the superscriptions.

Another point that seems ancient about our Apology is that it contains traces, and very interesting traces, of the use of a creed, very similar to the Apostolic Symbol, but involving certain notable points of difference. We shall discuss the question more at length by and by; but at present it will be interesting

to notice, especially in view of the obviously friendly attitude of the writer towards the Jews, that his creed contained a clause to the effect that

'He was crucified by the Jews,'

perhaps without the clause that was current in later times, 'under Pontius Pilate.' Now I am aware that there are some persons to whom this will seem an argument for a later date; for example M. Renan, Origines vi. p. 277, says: "les Chrétiens commençaient à faire retomber sur l'ensemble de la nation juive un reproche que sûrement ni Pierre ni Jacques ni l'auteur de l'Apocalypse ne songeaient à lui adresser, celui d'avoir crucifié Jésus." It would be interesting however to compare this statement of M. Renan with the language of Peter in Acts ii. 36, "Whom ye crucified;" of James in Ep. v. 6, "ye murdered the Just;" or with the writer of the Apocalypse where he describes Jerusalem as the spiritual Sodom and Egypt, "where also our Lord was crucified."

The very same charge is made by Justin in his dialogue with Trypho¹, who uses language very similar to that of the Epistle of James, and in discussing the miseries which have befallen the Jewish race, says pointedly "Fairly and justly have these things come upon you; for Ye slew the Just One." Why should we assume such a sentiment to be a mark of late date?

These references do not, however, suggest that the sentence in question was in the Creed. To prove that, we should have to go much farther afield, for the known forms of early creeds do not seem to contain it: if, however, we were to examine the Apocryphal Christian Literature of the early centuries, we should, no doubt, find many traces of the lost sentence. For example, it comes over and over in the Apocryphal Acts of John, a Gnostic document which Wright edited and translated from the Syriac. Here we find the sentence frequently in the very connexion which it would have with other Christian dogmatic statements if it had been incorporated with some actual form of the Symbol of Faith. When we find that these Acts give us as the staple of Apostolic teaching that

"The Jews crucified Him on the tree,
And He died
And rose after three days,
And He is God,
And He ascended to Heaven
And is at the right hand of His Father"

we must admit that the sequence of ideas, and probably the very words, are from a Creed.

The same thing is true when we find the Apostle speaking, and saying

"In the name of Jesus the Messiah, God,
Whom the Jews crucified and killed in Jerusalem;
And He died and was buried
And rose after three days:
And lo! He is above in Heaven
At the right hand of His Father."

At all events we may maintain that there is evidence for the diffusion of the Creed in early times under a slightly different form to that generally received, and if so, we may call it a mark of antiquity to have the Apology of Aristides expressing itself to that effect; for certainly no such sentence in the generally received Creed existed in later times, however widely the sentiment against the Jews may have been diffused.

It is interesting also to compare the custom of the early Christians in the matter of fasting, that they might relieve by their self-denial the necessities of the poor. This is precisely what we find described so fully in the Similitudes of Hermas (Sim. v. 3), where the directions are given that on the day when we fast we are ourselves to eat only bread and water, and calculate the amount saved thereby and bestow it on the poor. Now very many of the later fathers teach the same doctrine, that fasting and alms are conjoined in duty and merit, and that it is proper, under certain circumstances, for the church to call for such an expression of religion. But what makes for the antiquity of the Apology is that the whole church fasts, not merely one day, but two or three days, and that not by direction or rule, but because they are poor and have no other way of meeting the needs of those who are poorer

than themselves. It is a spontaneous, rather than a commanded charity, dictated at once by love and necessity. Can such a practice in such a form be other than early? But if the Apology is early in its doctrines and practices, where shall we place it? Must it not be at least as early as the first years of the reign of Antoninus Pius?

But here we are in difficulty again, for, if we assume that the Apology was presented to Antoninus Pius in person, we have no satisfactory evidence that Antoninus was ever in the East, or in Greece after his accession, and even the suspicions as to an Eastern visit belong to a later period of his reign, say A.D. 154. Did Aristides present the Apology at Rome or elsewhere? May we infer from his calling himself Marcianus Aristides, *Philosopher of Athens*, that he was in some city not his own natural dwelling-place? For that he came from Athens is deducible not only from his own statement but also from the fact to which we have already alluded that Antoninus wrote to Athens to suppress a persecution of the Christians. But this almost implies that Antoninus was not in Athens when he received the Apology, or where would be the need of writing a letter at all? He must have been out of Greece.

Only two solutions seem to present themselves, (i) that Aristides journeyed to Rome to present his apology; (ii) that Antoninus made some unrecorded visit to the East.

Now with regard to the second of these suppositions there is reason, outside of our argument and its necessities, to believe that some such visit must have taken place, and that Antoninus held court at Smyrna, some time after his accession to the throne.

In the celebrated letter of Irenaeus to Florinus (written probably later than A.D. 189) the writer speaks of having seen Florinus when he lived in lower Asia with Polycarp, when he was at the royal court, and rising in esteem there; he, Irenaeus, being at that time a boy. Now this seems to imply some kind of royal residence at Smyrna; but it has always been difficult to determine what is meant by such a royal residence. The problem is discussed by Lightfoot in his *Ignatius* (ed. ii. vol. I. p. 449). It cannot be Hadrian's visit in A.D. 129, which would be too early; and Lightfoot thinks that although there is some reason for believing

Antoninus Pius to have been in Syria, and presumably also in Asia Minor, somewhere about A.D. 154, 155, this date is too late, on account of the mention of Polycarp. Accordingly Lightfoot frames, with some hesitation, the following hypothesis: "About the year 136 T. Aurelius Fulvus was proconsul of Asia. Within two or three years of his proconsulate he was raised to the imperial throne, and is known as Antoninus Pius. Even during his proconsulate omens marked him as the future occupant of the imperial throne. ... Florinus may have belonged to his suite, and Irenaeus in after years might well call the proconsul's retinue the 'royal Court' by anticipation, especially if Florinus accompanied him to Rome, &c."

This ingenious hypothesis only fails to meet our requirement on one point, viz. that the name given to Antoninus in the Apology is the name given him after adoption, and so is subsequent to Feb. 25, A.D. 138.

But suppose we imagine a visit of Antoninus to Asia Minor some years later than this, we could find then some support for the theory that Aristides presented his Apology to the Emperor at Smyrna.

For we might say that the name of Marcianus is a conspicuous one in the Church at Smyrna. When the Church of the Smyrnaeans wrote for the Church of Philomelium the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, they employed to compose the narrative a person whom they characterise as our brother Marcianus¹. Now it is worthy of note that this person must have been conspicuous in the Church of Smyrna, for he is probably the same person to whom Irenaeus, whose relations with the Church at Smyrna are so intimate, dedicated one of his treatises². Moreover the relations of the Church to the Emperor through Florinus would have been favourable for the presentation of the Apology.

Let us then say, in recapitulation, that we have found it difficult to assign the Apology to any other period than the early years of the reign of Antoninus Pius; and it is at least conceivable that it may have been presented to the Emperor, along with other Christian writings, during an unrecorded visit of his to his ancient seat of government in Smyrna.

¹ Mart. Polyc. 20,

² Euseb. H. E. v. 26.

There are a few later references to Aristides to which we have drawn no attention hitherto, because it seemed to be impossible to extract any trustworthy data from them: they are as follows:

- (1) A passage in a letter of Jerome to Magnus, "Aristides philosophus, vir eloquentissimus, eidem principi (Hadriano) Apologeticum pro Christianis obtulit, contextum philosophorum sententiis, quem imitatus postea Justinus, et ipse philosophus." This is simply a réchauffé of the Eusebian data, with reflections thereupon. Justin being a philosopher, his Apology naturally imitates the philosophical treatise which has preceded his own.
 - (2) Martyrologium Vetus Romanum¹ ad v. Nonas Octobris.

"Athenis Dionysii Areopagitae sub Hadriano diversis tormentis passi, ut Aristides testis est in opere quod de Christiana religione composuit; hoc opus apud Athenienses inter antiquorum memorias clarissimum tenetur." Aristides himself is commemorated on ii. Kal. Septr. and it is said that in his treatise he maintained "quod Christus Jesus solus esset Deus."

It would be very interesting to determine how the Martyrologies arrived at these statements. Our Syriac Apology certainly contains no trace of an allusion to Dionysius the Areopagite; on the other hand it fairly enough teaches the Divinity of Christ. We would dismiss the statements at once as archæological fictions if it had not been that evidence has been produced for the existence of a Latin version of Aristides. Harnack's attention was drawn by the pastor Kawerau to the following letter of Witzel to Beatus Rhenanus, dated Bartholomew's day 1534. "Dedisti nobis Eusebium, praeterea Tertullianum. Restat ut pari nitore des Justinum Martyrem, Papiam et Ignatium graece excusum. Amabo, per Bibliothecas oberrare, venaturus si quid scripsit Quadratus, si praeter epistolam alia Polycarpus, si nonnihil praeter Apologeticon Aristides. Despice, si quae supersunt Cornelii et tanta bonorum librorum panolethria. Plures sunt Dionysii scriptores, sed omnes praeter unum Areopagitem desyderamus, qui utinam sua quoque in lingua extaret. Utinam exorirentur Stromata Clementis, breviter quicquid est κρόνϊον. Tineae pascuntur libris, quibus

¹ Migne, Patr. Lat. cxxIII.

homines pasci debebamus &c." I have given the extract from Harnack's copy¹, not having access to the original letter.

It seems to me that Witzel's language almost implies that the Apology was already in print in Latin. Is it conceivable that some portion of the Apology may have found its way into print before the year 1534 and remained unnoticed in later times?

But even if it existed in manuscript, we must leave it an open question whether it may not have contained some matter which is wanting in the Syriac; nevertheless it is \grave{a} priori extremely improbable that the story about the martyrdom of Dionysius the Areopagite can belong here.

Celsus and Aristides.

We have alluded above to a possible connexion between the True Word of Celsus and the Apology of Aristides, and it may be worth while to follow the matter up a little closer for the following reasons:

- 1. Celsus is undoubtedly very nearly contemporary with Aristides; although it is difficult to determine his date exactly (and even Origen was doubtful as to his identity), we may probably say with a good assurance of safety that he was at the zenith of his influence and fame under the reign of Antoninus Pius.
- 2. It is peculiarly difficult to determine what Christian books had come into the hands of Celsus, whether gospels or other literature. We know however for certain that he had read the dialogue between Jason and Papiscus, a work of Aristo of Pella, written not long after the close of the Jewish war under Hadrian, and so at a period very near to the one in which we are interested. Now if he were reading contemporary Christian literature he could hardly miss Aristides.
- 3. And since we find more and closer parallels between the fragments preserved by Origen from the great work of Celsus and our Apology than between most of the other books of the century, it is at least a fair question whether Aristides was not one of the persons to whom Celsus undertook to reply.

¹ Die Griechischen Apologeten, p. 107 note. I cannot find it in Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus by Horawitz and Hartfelder, Leipzig, 1886. I understand, however, from Prof. Kawerau, that it may be found in Epistolarum G. Wicelii libri tres, Lipsiae, 1537.

One of the leading beliefs in Aristides is that God made all things for the sake of man. This doctrine he repeats in various forms, shewing that the separate elements, the earth, the air, the fire, and the water together with the sun, moon and stars, are his ministers. Now Celsus seems to have been particularly opposed to this doctrine and to have discussed it at length: it was one of the points of contact between the Stoic philosophy and the Jewish and Christian faiths, and Celsus was, no doubt, well prepared to be diffuse on the subject by many previous philosophical encounters.

But he carries out the argument in detail: a providence over man is as reasonable as a providence over beasts and vegetables, which can be proved from the same data. Διὰ πολλῶν δ' ἐξῆς ἐγκαλεῖ ἡμῖν ὡς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ φάσκουσι πάντα πεποιηκέναι τὸν Θεόν, καὶ βούλεται ἐκ τῆς περὶ τῶν ζώων ἰστορίας καὶ τῆς ἐμφαινομένης αὐτοῖς ἀγχινοίας δεικνύναι, οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων ἢ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων ἔνεκεν γεγονέναι τὰ πάντα². Indeed, according to Celsus, Providence is more apparent in the case of ants and bees and the like, which obtain their food without labour or with much less labour than happens in the case of man. He will not hear of such a statement as that the sun and stars serve man, much less what Aristides affirms, that the sun was created to serve the multiplicity of human need. Do not, says he, quote me verses from Euripides about sunshine and shade serving man; how do they serve him any more than the ants or the flies, which sleep

¹ Origen c. Celsum, lib. Iv. 23.

and wake much as we do? εἰ δὲ καὶ τό, ""Ηλιος μὲν νύξ τε δουλεύει βροτοῖς," τί μᾶλλον ἡμῖν ἡ τοῖς μύρμηξι καὶ ταῖς μυίαις ;

Now of course we do not mean to suggest that Aristides invented the argument from Providence or that Celsus was the first to heap easy scorn upon it. The argument and the reply are commonplaces. Celsus's question as to whether the world was created for the sake of vegetables will be found discussed in Cicero, de Natura Deorum II. 133. "Cuiusnam causa tantarum rerum molitio sit? Arborumne et herbarum? quae quamquam sine sensu sunt, tamen a natura sustinentur. At id quidem absurdum est. An bestiarum? Nihilo probabilius, deos mutorum et nihil intelligentium causa tantum laborasse....Ita fit credibile deorum et hominum causa factum esse mundum, quaeque in eo sint omnia."

It is easy to see how both the Jewish and Christian teachers, starting from the same text, the first verse in the book of Genesis, and formulating the same statement of faith, that the Almighty was 'Maker of Heaven and Earth,' found themselves fighting in the ranks with the Stoics against the Epicureans, and so exposed from time to time to the infinite raillery which seemed to the latter school to be proper to the situation. As we have said, Aristides does not stand alone in the statement. Justin Martyr takes the same ground and implies that it is a part of the regular Christian teaching. "We are taught," says he, "that God in His goodness created all things in the beginning from formless matter, for the sake of man²;" and the unknown writer of the Epistle to Diognetus affirms that "God loved men, for whom He made the world, to whom He subjected all things that are in the earth."

It is however worthy of notice that in Aristides the argument is repeated over and over, and that Celsus answers it, as Origen thought, at unnecessary length. It is not therefore inconceivable that Aristides may have drawn the Epicurean fire upon himself (and in this matter we may certainly count Celsus with the Epicureans) by the stress which he laid on the point in his Apology.

Let us pass on to another point upon which Aristides is

¹ lib. iv. 77.

² Justin Apol. i, c, 10,

³ Ep. ad Diogn. 10.

somewhat original, viz. the doctrine of the races of the world and of their origin.

Aristides divides the world into four races, the Barbarian, the Greek, the Jew, the Christian. The last two races are curiously described; the Jews derive their origin from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: they went down from Syria into Egypt; they came back from Egypt into Syria. As for the Christians, the new race, they derive their origin from Jesus the Messiah, and He is called the Son of God Most High.

Now in the first book against Celsus, Origen remarks as follows: "Celsus promises that he will speak on the subject of the Jews later on, and he begins his discourse concerning our Saviour, as being the leader of our generation in so far as we are Christians¹, and he goes on to say that he was the leader of this teaching, a few years ago, being regarded by the Christians as the Son of God."

Now it is worthy of note that if Celsus is handling any written document, that document proceeded from the discussion of the Jews to the Christians, affirmed Christ to be the head of the new race, and declared that His followers regarded Him as the Son of God. The agreement at this point with Aristides is certainly striking.

When moreover we come to the discussion of the Jews, Celsus breaks out that the 'Jews were mere Egyptian runaways, and that this darling people of God had never done anything worth remembering²,' just as if he had passed over the names of the Patriarchs and fastened on the admission that the Jews had come out of Egypt. Accordingly Origen replies that it is universally agreed that the Jews reckon their genealogy from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; σαφèς δὴ ὅτι καὶ γενεαλογοῦνται Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν πατέρων τοῦ ᾿Αβραὰμ καὶ τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβ.

When Aristides deals with the beliefs of the Jews he expresses the remarkable opinion that the Jewish ritual is rather an adoration of angels than a worship of God. The expression is the more remarkable, because Aristides affects to reason throughout as the

 $^{^1}$ Orig. c. Cels. 1. 26 ώς γενομένου ἡγεμόνος τ $\hat{\eta}$ καθὸ Χριστιανοί έσμεν γενέσει ἡμῶν.

² Orig. c. Cels. Iv. 32.

The Symbol of the Faith in the time of Aristides.

Aristides the Philosopher is a Christian who has preserved the philosophic manner, and probably the philosophic dress, with a view to future service in the gospel. It seems to have been the practice of not a few of the famous second-century Christians to attract an audience in this way. Justin certainly did so, and almost as surely Tatian; and if these why not Aristides? But as we have already said, the professedly dispassionate presentation of the Christian case, the endeavour to talk reasonably on all sides successively, soon breaks down; the man throws off his disguise and gives the note of challenge: Christianus sum; nihil Christianum alienum a me puto. He talks of angels as though all men knew them, dashes through the dogmatic statements of the Church as though they were perfectly familiar, and without a

¹ Orig. c. Cels. 1, 26.

² Orig. c. Cels. III. 19.

word of preliminary explanation of terms, makes a peroration of the impending judgment-day. And so the philosopher with an imperial audience turns out to be another illustration of the Christian city that is set on a hill and cannot be hid.

It is especially interesting to observe that in the time of Aristides the Church already had a Symbol of the Faith: and we may reconstruct a good many of its sentences. Of course in such matters we proceed from the things that are practically certain to those which are less demonstrable; we should not start by saying that the words "Maker of heaven and earth" were proof of the existence of an approximately fixed symbol. But if we can establish other sentences with good confidence, there is no reason to omit these words from the reconstructed formula.

The certain passage from which we proceed is in the words:

"He was pierced (crucified) by the Jews;

"He died and was buried;"

"and they say that

after three days He rose, and ascended into Heaven."

It may be taken for granted that these words represent a part of the Symbolum Fidei as known to Aristides.

What else may we say was contained in his creed? We may add words which must have stood respectively at the beginning and ending of the Creed: viz. that God was the Maker of Heaven and Earth; and that Jesus Christ was to come to judge the world.

Whether we can go further is a more difficult question: but there is at least a strong suspicion that the creed contained the clause "He was born of the Virgin Mary;" for in Aristides' statement the language about the 'Hebrew virgin' precedes the account of the Crucifixion; moreover, here also, we find Aristides is most pronounced in the enunciation of the doctrine, and Celsus is emphatically scornful in the rejection of it. Accordingly Celsus brings forward the story of the infidelity of Mary, affirming that the father of Jesus was in reality a soldier whose name was Panthera¹. The same story appears in the Talmud under the name Pandera, which is a transliteration of the foregoing.

¹ Orig. c. Cels. 1. 32.

Indeed it has been generally held that the legend was invented by the Jews, through the difficulty of accounting for our Lord's birth; apparently, therefore, the Jews were in search of a more tenable hypothesis than the paternity of Joseph; and it is not unreasonable to refer to an early Jewish scandal the story which we find in the Talmud and in Celsus.

But if the story be Jewish in origin, it was certainly Greek in manufacture. Some persons have tried to explain the Greek name Panthera by regarding it as a symbol of violent and unrestrained lust. They are, however, mistaken: the name is simply a Greek anagram on the word 'Parthenos,' by which the Blessed Virgin was commonly known. Those who are familiar with the literary tricks of that time, its anagrams, acrostics, isopsephics, and the like, will have not the least difficulty in seeing that this is the true solution. The inventor has only changed the order of the letters and slightly altered the ending of the word. Everything that we know of the dogmatics of the early part of the second century agrees with the belief that at that period the Virginity of Mary was a part of the formulated Christian belief. Nor need we hesitate, in view of the antiquity of the Panthera-fable, to give the doctrine a place in the creed of Aristides.

We restore the fragments of Aristides' creed, then, as follows:

We believe in one God, Almighty Maker of Heaven and Earth: And in Jesus Christ His Son

Born of the Virgin Mary:

He was pierced by the Jews: He died and was buried: The third day He rose again: He ascended into Heaven:

He is about to come to judge.

The Armenian Fragment of the Apology.

We give, later on, the Latin translation of the Armenian fragment, as published by the Venetian editors. The passage has also been translated into German by von Himpel¹, and this translation will be found in Harnack's *Griechische Apologeten*, pp. 110—112. Von Himpel rightly affirms the Armenian text to have been made from the Greek: it will be observed, however, that the Armenian text has the same lacuna as the Syriac in the discourse on the four elements and the powers to which they are respectively subject. This lacuna would seem to be an early feature of the Greek text.

There are one or two points in which we may get some authority from the Armenian for the original text. For instance in c. ii. where the Syriac reads that the origin of the Greeks is to be traced through "Danaus the Egyptian, and through Kadmus, and through Dionysus." Here the Armenian reads "Danaus the Egyptian and Kadmus the Sidonian and Dionysus the Theban," and I am disposed to believe the words added in the Armenian belong there: for instance, we may compare Tatian's language², "Dionysus is absolute sovereign over the Thebans." In a similar manner something seems to have dropped in the Syriac after the statement that in God there is no distinction of male or female; for the Armenian text adds the reason "quia cupiditatibus agitatur qui huic est distinctioni obnoxius." Again in the opening sentences of the Apology the Armenian text has the words, "Eum autem qui rector atque creator est omnium, investigare perdifficile est3." We recognize at once in these words the ring of the characteristic Christian quotation from the Timaeus, which is usually employed to shew the superior illuminating power of Christian grace over philosophic research, but seems here to be taken in the Platonic sense. The Armenian is perhaps a little nearer to the Platonic language than the Syriac; both versions however will claim the passage from the Timaeus as a parallel.

¹ Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift, 1877, 11. p. 289, f. 1880, 1. p. 109—127.

² Cohortatio, c. vIII.

³ Plato, Timaeus, 28 C, τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὐρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν.

Allowing then for the occasional preservation of a passage in greater purity by the Armenian fragment, we shall find that the Armenian translator has often made changes, and added glosses, and epitomized sentences. For example, in the summary of the Christian Faith, he describes the Son as the Logos, His mother as the Theotokos. When the disciples are sent forth, in order that a certain οἰκονομία may be fulfilled, the Armenian translator calls it a dispensation of illuminating truth; the preaching too is with 'signs following,' 'comitantibus prodigiis,' which seems to come from Mark xvi. 20 and would be, if genuine, one of the earliest illustrations of that text. It will be seen how large an element of paraphrase is found in the Armenian text.

The Armenian Fragment (from the Venice edition).

IMPERATORI CÆSARI HADRIANO, ARISTIDES,

PHILOSOPHUS ATHENIENSIS.

Ego, O Rex, Dei providentia creatus, hunc mundum ingressus sum, et caelis, terra ac mari, sole, luna et stellis, caeterisque omnibus creaturis conspectis, huius mundi constitutionem admirans miratus sum, atque conscius factus sum mihi, quoniam omnia quae sunt in mundo necessitate ac vi diriguntur, omnium creatorem et rectorem esse Deum: quia iis omnibus quae reguntur atque moventur, fortior est creator et rector.

Eum autem, qui rector atque creator est omnium, investigare perdifficile atque in immensum pertinens mihi videtur: penitus vero eum et certa ratione describere, quum inexplicabilis et ineffabilis sit, impossibile et sine ulla prorsus utilitate. Deus enim naturam habet infinitam, imperscrutabilem et creaturis omnibus incomprehensibilem. Hoc unum scire necesse est, qui creaturas universas Providentia sua gubernat, ipsum esse Dominum Deum et creatorem omnium: quia visibilia omnia creavit bonitate sua, eaque humano generi donavit. Quapropter Illum solum, utpote unum Deum, nos adorare et glorificare oportet: unumquemque autem nostrum proximum suum sicut semetipsum diligere.

Verumtamen de Deo saltem sciendum est, Eum ab alio factum non fuisse, neque semetipsum fecisse, atque, a nullo circumscriptum, omnia comprehendere. Ex se ipsomet est¹. Ipse sapientia immortalis, principio et fine carens, immortalis atque aeternus, perfectus, nulli necessitati obnoxius, et necessitatibus omnium satisfaciens, nullo indigens et indigentiis omnium ipse magnificus opitulator.

Ipse est principio carens, quia, qui habet principium, habet et finem. Ipse sine nomine, quod quicumque nomine appellatur, creatus est factusque ab alio. Ei neque colores sunt neque forma: quod, quicumque his praeditus est, mensurabilis est, limitibusque cogitur. Eius naturae nulla inest maris et feminae distinctio, quia cupiditatibus agitatur qui huic est distinctioni obnoxius. Ipse sub caelis incomprehensibilis est, quia caelos excedit: nec caeli caelorum Illo maiores sunt, quia caeli caelorum et creaturae omnes quae sub caelis sunt, ab Illo comprehenduntur.

Ipsi nemo contrarius neque adversarius: quod si quis Ei contrarius et adversarius esse posset, eidem compar fieri videretur.

Ipse immobilis est atque praeter quemcumque terminum et circuitum: quia ubi et unde moveri possit locus deest. Ipse neque mensura comprehendi, neque circumdari potest, quia Ipse omnia replet, atque est ultra omnes visibiles et invisibiles creaturas. Ipse neque ira, neque indignatione movetur, quia nulla caecitate afficitur, quum omnino et absolute sit intellectualis. Propterea hisce omnibus miraculis variis omnibusque beneficiis Ipse omnia creavit. Sacrificiis, oblationibus et hostiis Ipse non indiget, neque, ulla in re, visibilibus creaturis opus habet; quia omnia replet, et omnium egestatibus satisfacit, Ipse numquam indigens ac semper gloriosus.

De Deo sapienter loqui ab ipso Deo mihi datum est, et pro meis viribus locutus sum, quin tamen altitudinem imperscrutabilis magnitudinis Ejus comprehendere possem. Sola fide vero Illum glorificans adoro.

Nunc igitur ad genus humanum veniamus et quinam praefatas veritates secuti fuerint videbimus, et quinam ab eis erraverint. Compertum est nobis, o Rex, quatuor esse humani generis stirpes, quae sunt Barbarorum, Graecorum, Hebraeorum atque Christianorum. Ethnici et Barbari genus suum ducunt a Belo, Crono et

¹ Sensus dubius: armeniaca verba idem sonant ac graeca αὐτογενès είδος.

Hiera, aliisque suis Divis pluribus. Graeci vero a Jove, qui Zeus vel Jupiter dicitur, originem trahunt, per Helenum, Xuthum, aliosque eorum descendentes, nempe Helladem, Inacum, Phoroneum, ac demum Danaum Aegyptium, Cadmum Sidonium, ac Dionysium Thebanum. Hebraei autem genus suum ducunt ex Abrahamo, Isaaco, Jacobo, et duodecim Jacobi filiis, qui e Syria in Aegyptum se receperunt, et a legislatore suo Hebraei nuncupati fuerunt, inde vero terram promissionis ingressi, Judaei sunt appellati. Christianorum tandem genus a Domino Jesu Christo oritur.

Ipse Dei altissimi est Filius, et una cum Spiritu Sancto revelatus est nobis: de caelis descendit ex Hebraea Virgine natus, ex Virgine carnem assumpsit, assumptaque humana natura, semetipsum Dei filium revelavit. Qui Evangelio suo vivificante mundum universum, consolatoria sua bonitate, sibi captivum fecit.

Ipse est Verbum, qui ex progenie Hebraica, secundum carnem, ex Maria virgine Deipara natus est. Ipse est qui Apostolos duodecim inter suos discipulos elegit, ut mundum universum dispensatione illuminantis Veritatis suae institueret. Ipse ab Hebraeis crucifixus est: a mortuis resurrexit et ad caelos ascendit: in mundum universum discipulos suos mittens, qui divino et admirabili lumine suo, comitantibus prodigiis, omnes gentes sapientiam docerent. Quorum praedicatio in hunc usque diem germinat atque fructificat, orbem universum vocans ad lucem.

Quatuor ergo nationes, O Rex, ostendi tibi: Barbaros, Graecos, Hebraeos atque Christianos.

Divinitati spiritualis natura propria est, Angelis ignea, daemoniis aquosa, generique humano terrestris.

We have now reprinted all that is known of the Armenian translation of the Apology; it is out of our limit and beyond our measure to think of reprinting the actual Armenian text. For the purpose of comparison we add, however, another copy of the same Armenian fragment, taken from a MS. at Edschmiazin, and translated into English by Mr F. C. Conybeare, of Oxford, for whose kindly aid we are very grateful. According to the information which he has supplied, the MS. at Edschmiazin was written on paper, and is much worn by age. The date was certainly not

later than the eleventh century. The fragment from the Apology which it contains was followed by the fragment from the Homily on the Penitent Thief. Here and there the text was illegible, and in these cases the missing words have been supplied from the Venice text, as reprinted by Pitra. The two texts in question are moreover in very close agreement, except for the occasional addition of a word or two by the Edschmiazin MS. The rendering is designedly a literal one.

The Armenian Fragment (from the Edschmiazin MS.).

TO THE AUTOCRATIC CAESAR ADRIANOS FROM ARISTIDES, ATHENIAN PHILOSOPHER.

I, O Ruler, who was by the providence of God created and fashioned man in the world, and who have beheld the heaven and the earth and the sea, the sun and the moon and the stars and all creatures, wondered and was amazed at the eternal order thereof. I also by reflection learned that the world and all that is therein is by necessity and force guided and moved and of the whole God is controuler and orderer: for that which controuls is more powerful than that which is controuled and moved. To enquire about Him who is guardian and controuls all things seems to me to quite exceed the comprehension and to be most difficult, and to speak accurately concerning Him is beyond compass of thought and of speech, and bringeth no advantage; for His nature is infinite and unsearchable, and imperceptible,2 and inaccessible to all creatures. We can only know that He who governs by His providence all created things, He is Lord and God and creator of all, who ordered all things visible in His beneficence, and graciously bestowed them on the race of man. Now it is meet that we serve and glorify Him alone as God, and love one another as ourselves. But this much alone can we know concerning God,

¹ Here there is a copyist's error in the Edschmiazin text.

² Here the Edschmiazin text adds a word which means 'not to be observed or looked at.'

that He was not generated from any source, and did not Himself make Himself, and is not contained by aught, but Himself contains all. Autoveves eilos and wisdom immortal, without beginning or end, not passing away and undying, He is complete and wanteth nothing, while He fulfilleth all wants. In Himself He wanteth nought, but gives to and fulfils the needs of all. In Himself He is without beginning, for He is beginning of everything whatever, and is perfect. In Himself He is nameless, for whatever is named is fashioned out of something else² and created. Colour and form of Him there is not, for that falls under measure and limit, unto whatsoever colour and form belong. Male and female in that nature there is not, for that is subject to particular passions, in whatsoever that distinction exists. Within the heavens He is not contained, for He is beyond³ the heavens; neither are the heavens greater than He, for the heavens and all creation are contained in Him. Counter to Him and opposed there is no one: if any one be found counter to Him, it appears that that one becometh associate with Him. He is unmoved and unmeasured and ineffable; for there is no place whence or with which He could move; and He is not, by being measured, contained or environed on any side, for it is Himself that filleth all, and He transcends all things visible and invisible. Wrath and anger there is not in Him, for there is not in Him blindness, but He is wholly and entirely rational, and on that account He established creation with divers wonders and entire beneficence. Need hath He none of victims and oblations and sacrifices, and of all that is in the visible creation He wanteth nought. For He fulfilleth the wants of all and completeth them, and being in need of nothing He is glorified unto all time.

Now by the grace of God it was given me to speak wisely concerning Him. So far as I have received the faculty I will speak, yet not according to the measure of the inscrutability of His greatness shall I be able to do so, but by faith alone do I glorify and adore Him.

Let us next come to the race of man, and see who are capable

¹ αὐτογενès (or αὐτογέννητον) είδος is the Greek that answers to the Armenian texts. 'Ex se ipsomet est' does not give the sense. I give the Greek, for I really hardly know how to render it in English.

² Or "by another."

³ ἐπέκεινα.

of receiving the truth of these sayings, and who are gone astray. It is manifest¹, O Ruler, for there are four tribes² of the human race. There are barbarians, and some are Greeks and others Hebrews, and there are who are Christians. But the heathens and barbarians count their descent from Baal, and from Cronos, and from Hera, and from many others of their gods. But the Greeks say Zeus (who is Dios) is their founder³, and reckon their descent from Helenos and Xuthos, and one after another from Hellas, Inachos and Phoroneus, and also finally from Danaus the Egyptian, and from Cadmus the Sidonian, and Dionysius the Theban.

But the Jews reckon their race from Abraham, and Abraham's son they say was Isaac, and from Isaac Jacob, and from Jacob the twelve who migrated from Assyria into Egypt and were there named the tribes of the Hebrews by their lawgiver, and having come into the land of recompence, were named......⁴ the tribes of the Jews.

But the Christians reckon their race from the Lord Jesus Christ. He is Himself Son of God on high, who was manifested of the Holy Spirit, came down from heaven, and being born of a Hebrew virgin took on His flesh from the virgin, and was manifested in the nature of humanity the Son of God: who sought to win the entire world to His eternal goodness by His life-giving preaching⁵. He it is who was according to the flesh born of the race of the Hebrews, by the God-bearing⁶ virgin Miriam. He chose the twelve disciples, and He by his illuminating truth, dispensing

¹ So it stands in the Venice text: but in the Edschmiazin copy, for 'manifest' there is a word which means 'the name' followed by a lacuna of a few letters, as if the scribe had intended to read 'I will recount the names, O Ruler,' or something of that kind.

² The word answers to the Greek $\phi\nu\lambda\alpha l$ or $\delta\hat{\eta}\mu\omega l$. In the same sense at the end of the fragment another word is used, answering rather to $\gamma\ell\nu\eta$.

³ These three words are added to make sense, the whole passage being grammatically much confused.

⁴ Here the Edschmiazin MS. was unreadable from age. The printed text has no lacuna and gives no hint of the word whatever it was which was read in the Edschmiazin text.

⁵ εὐαγγέλιον.

⁶ The word $\Theta \epsilon o \tau \delta \kappa o s$ is implied.

it¹ taught, all the world, and was nailed on the cross by the Jews. Who rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, and sent forth His disciples into the whole world², and taught all with divinely miraculous and profoundly wise wonders. Their preaching until this day blossoms and bears fruit, and summons all the world to receive the light.

These are the four tribes, whom we set before thee, O Ruler, Barbarians, Greeks, Jews and Christians. But to the Deity is appointed the spiritual, and to angels the fiery, and to devils the watery, and to the race of men the earth.

* * * * * * * * *

An additional Armenian Fragment of Aristides.

Over and above the fragments of the lost Apology of Aristides, and the homily de Latrone, there is a scrap printed by Pitra in his Spicilegium Solesmense which professes to come from an epistle of Aristides to all Philosophers. It is, as far as we can judge, in the form in which we have it presented to us, a theological product of the time of the Monophysite controversy. But we must bear in mind what we have learned from the Armenian fragment of the Apology, that an Armenian translation is made up out of the matter of the original writer plus the terms and definitions of the translator, as for instance we see to have happened in the ascription of the term Θεοτόκος to the Blessed Virgin. And the question is whether under the amplified folds of the theology of this fragment printed by Pitra there may be hidden the more scanty terms of a theologian of the second century, and if so, whether the writer be our Aristides, and the work quoted be the Apology or some other work. In order to test this point, we will give a rendering of the fragment into Greek, for which again I am indebted to the kindness of Mr Convbeare.

¹ Οἰκονομικόs is here rendered. Perhaps it should be taken as an epithet of 'truth,' for in the original it precedes the word 'illuminating,'

² Οἰκουμένην.

Armenian Fragment. (Frag. iii. of Pitra.)

FROM AN EPISTLE OF ARISTIDES TO ALL PHILOSOPHERS.

Πάντ' ἔπαθε παθήματα ἀληθινῷ σὺν αὐτοῦ σώματι, ὁ θελήματι Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος δεξάμενος, ἥνωσε τὴν σάρκα¹ ἑαυτῷ² τὴν παρὰ³ παρθένου Ἑβραϊκῆς τῆς ἁγίας Μαριὰμ ἀρρητῷ καὶ ἀτόμῳ ἐνότητι.

Now with reference to the foregoing passage, we may say at once that the concluding terms are not second-century language at all. On the other hand, the reference to the "Hebrew virgin" is precisely the language of the Apology. Further, the opening words of the fragment, with their allusion to a real passion of a real body, are certainly anti-Docetic, and therefore may be taken as second-century theology. We may compare with them the sentiments of the Ignatian epistles, as for example the letter to the Smyrnaeans (c. ii.), where we read:—

ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ἔπαθεν δι' ἡμᾶς· καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν· οὐχ ὥσπερ ἄπιστοί τινες λέγουσιν τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι.

It does not, therefore, seem as if these words in the opening of the fragment were a translator's invention or addition. They have a second-century ring about them. If so, then the extract is either a translation of a paragraph of the Apology, or of some other tract by the same writer, and probably the latter. We have, however, no means of discriminating further the original form of the sentence from the later accretions. It is, however, by no means impossible that the heading may be correct; that Aristides may have written an epistle or address to Philosophers on the subject of the Christian religion in general, or of the Incarnation in particular.

¹ The same word is used by the translator to render $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ and $\sigma \acute{a} \rho \xi$.

² More exactly $\dot{\epsilon}avro\hat{v}$: an additional word being necessary in the Armenian in order to give the sense 'conjunxit sibi': but the sense seems to require $\dot{\epsilon}avr\hat{\phi}$.

³ Or čĸ.

THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES, TRANSLATED FROM THE SYRIAC.

Again, the apology which Aristides the philosopher made before Hadrian the king concerning the worship of God.

[To the Emperor] Caesar Titus Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, from Marcianus Aristides, a philosopher of Athens.

I. I, O king, by the grace of God came into this world; and having contemplated the heavens and the earth and the seas, and beheld the sun and the rest of the orderly creation. I was amazed at the arrangement of the world; and I comprehended that the world and all that is therein are moved by the impulse of another, and I understood that he that moveth them is God, who is hidden in them and concealed from them: and this is well known, that that which moveth is more powerful than that which is moved. And that I should investigate concerning this Mover of all, as to how He exists—for this is evident to me, for He is incomprehensible in His nature—and that I should dispute concerning the stedfastness of His government, so as to comprehend it fully, is not profitable for me; for no one is able perfectly to comprehend it. But I say concerning the Mover of the world, that He is God of all, who made all for the sake of man; and it is evident to me that this is expedient, that one should fear God, and not grieve man.

Now I say that God is not begotten, not made; a constant nature, without beginning and without end; immortal, complete, and incomprehensible: and in saying that He is complete, I mean this; that there is no deficiency in Him, and He stands in need of nought, but everything stands in need of Him: and in saying that He is without beginning, I mean this; that everything which has a beginning has also an end; and that which has an end is dissoluble. He has no name; for everything that has a name is associated with the created; He has no likeness, nor composition of members; for he who possesses this is associated with things

fashioned. He is not male, nor is He female: the heavens do not contain Him; but the heavens and all things visible and invisible are contained in Him. Adversary He has none; for there is none that is more powerful than He; anger and wrath He possesses not, for there is nothing that can stand against Him. Error and forgetfulness are not in His nature, for He is altogether wisdom and understanding, and in Him consists all that consists. He asks no sacrifice and no libation, nor any of the things that are visible; He asks not anything from anyone; but all ask from Him.

II. Since then it has been spoken to you by us concerning God, as far as our mind was capable of discoursing concerning Him, let us now come to the race of men, in order that we may know which of them hold any part of that truth which we have spoken concerning Him, and which of them are in error therefrom.

This is plain to you, O king, that there are four races of men in this world; Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians.

Now the Barbarians reckon the head of the race of their religion from Kronos and from Rhea and the rest of their gods: but the Greeks from Helenus, who is said to be from Zeus; and from Helenus was born Aeolus and Xythus, and the rest of the family from Inachus and Phoroneus, and last of all from Danaus the Egyptian and from Kadmus and from Dionysus.

Moreover the Jews reckon the head of their race from Abraham, who begat Isaac, from whom was born Jacob, who begat twelve sons who removed from Syria and settled in Egypt, and there were called the race of the Hebrews by their law-giver: but at last they were named Jews.

The Christians, then, reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the Son of God most High; and it is said that God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God. This is taught from that Gospel which a little while ago was spoken among them as being preached; wherein if ye also will read, ye will comprehend the power that is upon it. This Jesus, then, was born of the tribe of the Hebrews; and He had twelve disciples, in order that a certain dispensation of His might be fulfilled. He was

pierced by the Jews; and He died and was buried; and they say that after three days He rose and ascended to heaven; and then these twelve disciples went forth into the known parts of the world, and taught concerning His greatness with all humility and sobriety; and on this account those also who to-day believe in this preaching are called Christians, who are well known. There are then four races of mankind, as I said before, Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians.

To God then ministers wind, and to angels fire; but to demons water, and to men earth.

III. Let us then begin with the Barbarians, and by degrees we will proceed to the rest of the peoples, in order that we may understand which of them hold the truth concerning God, and which of them error.

The Barbarians then, inasmuch as they did not comprehend God, erred with the elements; and they began to serve created things instead of the Creator of them1, and on this account they made likenesses and they enclosed them in temples; and lo! they worship them and guard them with great precaution, that their gods may not be stolen by robbers; and the Barbarians have not understood that whatsoever watches must be greater than that which is watched; and that whatsoever creates must be greater than that whatever is created: if so be then that their gods are too weak for their own salvation, how will they furnish salvation to mankind? The Barbarians then have erred with a great error in worshipping dead images which profit them not. And it comes to me to wonder also, O king, at their philosophers, how they too have erred and have named gods those likenesses which have been made in honour of the elements; and the wise men have not understood that these very elements are corruptible and dissoluble; for if a little part of the element be dissolved or corrupted, all of it is dissolved and corrupted. If then these elements are dissolved and corrupted, and compelled to be subject to another harder than themselves, and are not in their nature gods, how can they call gods those likenesses which are made in their honour? Great then is the error which their philosophers have brought upon their followers.

¹ Rom. i. 25.

IV. Let us turn then, O king, to the elements themselves, in order that we may shew concerning them that they are not gods, but a creation, corruptible and changeable, which is in the likeness of man¹. But God is incorruptible and unchangeable and invisible, while seeing, turning and changing all things.

Those therefore who think concerning earth that it is God have already erred, since it is digged and planted and delved; and since it receives the defilement of the excrement of men and of beasts and of cattle: and since sometimes it becomes what is useless; for if it be burned it becomes dead, for from baked clay there springs nothing: and again, if water be collected on it, it becomes corrupted along with its fruits: and lo! it is trodden on by men and beasts, and it receives the impurity of the blood of the slain; and it is digged and filled with the dead and becomes a repository for bodies: none of which things can that holy and venerable and blessed and incorruptible nature receive. And from this we have perceived that the earth is not God but a creature of God.

V. And in like manner again have those erred who have thought concerning water that it is God. For water was created for the use of man and in many ways it is made subject to him. For it is changed, and receives defilement, and is corrupted, and loses its own nature when cooked with many things, and receives colours which are not its own; being moreover hardened by the cold and mixed and mingled with the excrement of men and beasts and with the blood of the slain: and it is compelled by workmen, by means of the compulsion of channels, to flow and be conducted against its own will, and to come into gardens and other places, so as to cleanse and carry out all the filth of men, and wash away all defilement, and supply man's need of itself. Wherefore it is impossible that water should be God, but it is a work of God and a part of the world.

So too those have erred not a little who thought concerning fire that it is God: for it too was created for the need of men: and in many ways it is made subject to them, in the service of food and in the preparation of ornaments and the other things of

¹ Rom, i, 23,

which your majesty is aware: whilst in many ways it is extinguished and destroyed.

And again those who have thought concerning the blast of winds that it is God, these also have erred: and this is evident to us, that these winds are subject to another, since sometimes their blast is increased and sometimes it is diminished and ceases, according to the commandment of Him who subjects them. Since for the sake of man they were created by God, in order that they might fulfil the needs of trees and fruits and seeds, and that they might transport ships upon the sea; those ships which bring to men their necessary things, from a place where they are found to a place where they are not found; and furnish the different parts of the world. Since then this wind is sometimes increased and sometimes diminished, there is one place in which it does good and another where it does harm, according to the nod of Him who rules it: and even men are able by means of well-known instruments to catch and coerce it that it may fulfil for them the necessities which they demand of it: and over itself it has no power at all; wherefore it is not possible that winds should be called gods, but a work of God.

VI. So too those have erred who have thought concerning the sun that he is God. For lo! we see him, that by the necessity of another he is moved and turned and runs his course; and he proceeds from degree to degree, rising and setting every day, in order that he may warm the shoots of plants and shrubs, and may bring forth in the air which is mingled with him every herb which is on the earth. And in calculation the sun has a part with the rest of the stars in his course, and although he is one in his nature, he is mixed with many parts, according to the advantage of the needs of men: and that not according to his own will, but according to the will of Him that ruleth him. Wherefore it is not possible that the sun should be God, but a work of God; and in like manner also the moon and stars.

VII. But those who have thought concerning men of old, that some of them are gods, these have greatly erred: as thou, even thou, O king, art aware, that man consists of the four elements and of soul and spirit, and therefore is he even called World, and apart from any one of these parts he does not exist. He has

beginning and end, and he is born and also suffers corruption. But God, as I have said, has none of this in His nature, but He is unmade and incorruptible. On this account, then, it is impossible that we should represent him as God who is man by nature, one to whom sometimes, when he looketh for joy, grief happens; and for laughter, and weeping befals him; one that is passionate and jealous, envious and regretful, along with the rest of the other defects: and in many ways more corrupted than the elements or even than the beasts.

And thence, O king, it is right for us to understand the error of the Barbarians, that, whereas they have not investigated concerning the true God, they have fallen away from the truth and have gone after the desire of their own mind, in serving elements subject to dissolution, and dead images: and on account of their error they do not perceive who is the true God.

VIII. Let us return now to the Greeks in order that we may know what opinion they have concerning the true God.

The Greeks then because they are wiser than the Barbarians have erred even more than the Barbarians, in that they have introduced many gods that are made; and some of them they have represented as male and some of them as female; and in such a way that some of their gods were found to be adulterers and murderers, and jealous and envious, and angry and passionate, and murderers of fathers, and thieves and plunderers. And they say that some of them were lame and maimed; and some of them wizards, and some of them utterly mad; and some of them played on harps; and some of them wandered on mountains: and some of them died outright; and some were struck by lightning, and some were made subject to men, and some went off in flight, and some were stolen by men; and lo! some of them were wept and bewailed by men; and some, they say, went down to Hades; and some were sorely wounded, and some were changed into the likeness of beasts in order that they might commit adultery with the race of mortal women; and some of them have been reviled for sleeping with males: and some of them, they say, were in wedlock with their mothers and sisters and daughters; and they say of their gods that they committed adultery with the daughters of men, and from them was born a certain race which was also

mortal. And of some of their goddesses they say that they contended about beauty and came for judgment before men. The Greeks, then, O king, have brought forward what is wicked, ridiculous and foolish concerning their gods and themselves; in that they called such like persons gods, who are no gods: and hence men have taken occasion to commit adultery and fornication, and to plunder and do everything that is wicked and hateful and abominable. For if those who are called their gods have done all those things that are written above, how much more shall men do them who believe in those who have done these things! and from the wickedness of this error, lo! there have happened to men frequent wars and mighty famines, and bitter captivity and deprivation of all things: and lo! they endure them, and all these things befal them from this cause alone: and when they endure them they do not perceive in their conscience that because of their error these things happen to them.

IX. Now let us come to the history of these their gods in order that we may prove accurately concerning all those things which we have said above.

Before everything else the Greeks introduce as a god Kronos, which is interpreted Chiun; and the worshippers of this deity sacrifice to him their children: and some of them they burn while yet living. Concerning him they say that he took him Rhea to wife; and from her he begat many sons; from whom he begat also Dios, who is called Zeus; and at the last he went mad and, for fear of an oracle which was told him, began to eat his children. And from him Zeus was stolen away, and he did not perceive it: and at the last Zeus bound him and cut off his genitals and cast them in the sea: whence, as they say in the fable, was born Aphrodite, who is called Astera: and he cast Kronos bound into darkness. Great then is the error and scorn which the Greeks have introduced concerning the head of their gods, in that they have said all these things about him, O king. It is not possible that God should be bound or amputated; otherwise it is a great misfortune.

And after Kronos they introduce another god, Zeus; and they say concerning this one, that he received the headship and became king of all the gods; and they say concerning him that he was changed into cattle and everything else, in order that he might

commit adultery with mortal women, and might raise up to himself children from them. Since at one time they say he was changed into a bull on account of his passion for Europa and for Pasiphae; and again he was changed into the likeness of gold on account of his passion for Danae: and into a swan, through his passion for Leda; and into a man through his passion for Antiope; and into lightning on account of his passion for the Moon: so that from these he begat many children: for they say that from Antiope he begat Zethus and Amphion; and from the Moon, Dionysus; from Alkmena, Herakles; and from Leto, Apollo and Artemis; and from Danae, Perseus; and from Leda, Castor and Polydeuces and Helene; and from Mnemosyne he begat nine daughters, those whom he called the Muses; and from Europa, Minos and Rhadamanthus and Sarpedon. But last of all he was changed into the likeness of an eagle on account of his passion for Ganymede the shepherd.

Because of these stories, O king, much evil has befallen the race of men who are at this present day, since they imitate their gods, and commit adultery, and are defiled with their mothers and sisters, and in sleeping with males: and some of them have dared to kill even their fathers. For if he, who is said to be the head and king of their gods, has done these things, how much more shall his worshippers imitate him! And great is the madness which the Greeks have introduced into their history concerning him: for it is not possible that a god should commit adultery or fornication, or should approach to sleep with males, or that he should be a parricide; otherwise he is much worse than a destructive demon.

X. And again they introduce another god, Hephaestus; and they say of him that he is lame and wearing a cap on his head, and holding in his hand tongs and hammer; and working in brass in order that therefrom he may find his needed sustenance. Is then this god so much in need? Whereas it is impossible for a god to be needy or lame: otherwise he is very weak.

And again they introduce another god and call him Hermes; and they say that he is a thief, loving avarice and coveting gains, and a magician and maimed and an athlete and an interpreter of words: whereas it is impossible for a god to be a magician, or

avaricious, or maimed, or coveting anything that is not his, or an athlete: and if it be found to be otherwise, he is of no use.

And after him they introduce another god, Asclepius; and they say that he is a physician and prepares medicines and bandages in order that he may satisfy his need of sustenance. Is then this god in need? And he at last was struck by lightning by Zeus, on account of Tyndareus the Lacedemonian; and so he died. If then Asclepius was a god, and when struck by lightning was unable to help himself, how is it that he was able to help others? Whereas it is an impossible thing that the divine nature should be in need, or that it should be struck by lightning.

And again they introduce another god and call him Ares, and they say that he is a warrior and jealous, and covets sheep and things which do not belong to him, and acquires possessions through his weapons; and of him they say that at last he committed adultery with Aphrodite and was bound by a tiny boy Eros, and by Hephaestus the husband of Aphrodite: whereas it is impossible that a god should be a warrior or a prisoner or an adulterer.

And again they say of Dionysus that he too is a god, who celebrates festivals by night and teaches drunkenness, and carries off women that do not belong to him: and at the last they say that he went mad and left his female attendants and fled to the wilderness; and in this madness of his he ate serpents; and at the last he was killed by Titan. If then Dionysus was a god, and when slain was not able to help himself; how is it that he was able to help others?

Herakles, too, they introduce, and they say of him that he is a god, a hater of things hateful, a tyrant and a warrior, and a slayer of the wicked: and of him they say that at the last he went mad and slew his children and cast himself into the fire and died. If therefore Herakles be a god and in all these evils was unable to stand up for himself, how was it that others were asking help from him? Whereas it is impossible that a god should be mad or drunken or a slayer of his children, or destroyed by fire.

XI. And after him they introduce another god and call him Apollo: and they say of him that he is jealous and changeable; and

sometimes he holds a bow and a quiver, and sometimes a lyre and a plectrum; and he gives oracles to men, in order that he may receive a reward from them. Is then this god in need of reward? Whereas it is disgraceful that all these things should be found in a god.

And after him they introduce Artemis a goddess, the sister of Apollo; and they say that she was a huntress; and she carried a bow and arrows, and went about on mountains leading dogs, either to hunt the deer or the wild boars. Whereas it is disgraceful that a maid should go about by herself on mountains and follow the chase of beasts. And therefore it is not possible that Artemis should be a goddess.

Again they say of Aphrodite that she forsooth is a goddess; and sometimes forsooth she dwells with their gods, and sometimes she commits adultery with men; and sometimes she has Ares for her lover and sometimes Adonis, who is Tammuz: and sometimes forsooth Aphrodite is wailing and weeping for the death of Tammuz: and they say that she went down to Hades in order that she might ransom Adonis from Persephone, who was the daughter of Hades. If then Aphrodite be a goddess and was unable to help her lover in his death, how is she able to help others? And this is a thing impossible to be listened to, that the divine nature should come to weeping and wailing and adultery.

And again they say of Tammuz that he is a god; and he is forsooth a hunter and an adulterer; and they say that he was killed by a blow from a wild boar, and was not able to help himself.

And if he was not able to help himself, how is he able to take care of the human race? And this is impossible, that a god should be an adulterer or a hunter or that he should have died by violence.

And again they say of Rhea that she forsooth is the mother of their gods; and they say of her that she had at one time a lover Atys, and she was rejoicing in corruptible men; and at the last she established lamentations, and was bewailing her lover Atys. If then the mother of their gods was not able to help her lover and rescue him from death, how is it possible that she should help others? It is disgraceful then that a goddess should lament and weep, and that she should have joy over corruptible beings.

Again they bring forward Kore; and they say that she was a goddess and that she was carried off by Pluto and was not able to help herself. If then she is a goddess and was not able to help herself, how is she able to help others? For a goddess who is carried off is extremely weak.

All these things, then, O king, the Greeks have introduced forward about their gods, and have invented and said concerning them: whence all men have taken occasion to do all wicked and impure things: and thereby the whole earth has been corrupted.

XII. Now the Egyptians, because they are more evil and ignorant than all peoples upon the earth, have erred more than all men. For the worship of the Barbarians and the Greeks did not suffice them, but they introduced also the nature of beasts, and said concerning it that they were gods: and also of the creeping things which are found on the dry land and in the waters, and of the plants and herbs they have said that some of them are gods, and they have become corrupt in all madness and impurity more than all peoples that are upon the earth. For of old time they worshipped Isis; and they say that she forsooth is a goddess, who had forsooth a husband Osiris, her brother; but when forsooth Osiris was killed by his brother Typhon, Isis fled with her son Horus to Byblos in Syria and was there for a certain time until that her son was grown: and he contended with his uncle Typhon and killed him, and thereupon Isis returned and went about with her son Horus, and was seeking for the body of Osiris her lord, and bitterly bewailing his death. If therefore Isis be a goddess, and was not able to help Osiris her brother and lord, how is it possible that she should help others? Whereas it is impossible that the divine nature should be afraid and flee, or weep and wail. Otherwise it is a great misfortune.

But of Osiris they say that he is a god, a beneficent one; and he was killed by Typhon and could not help himself; and it is evident that this cannot be said of Deity.

And again they say of Typhon, his brother, that he is a god, a fratricide, and slain by his brother's son and wife since he was unable to help himself. And how can one who does not help himself be a god?

Now because the Egyptians are more ignorant than the rest of



the peoples, these and the like gods did not suffice them, but they also put the name of gods on the beasts which are merely soulless. For some men among them worship the sheep, and others the calf; and some of them the pig, and others the shadfish; and some of them the crocodile, and the hawk, and the cormorant, and the kite, and the vulture, and the eagle, and the crow; some of them worship the cat, and others the fish Shibbuta: some of them the dog, and some of them the serpent, and some the asp, and others the lion, and others garlic, and onions, and thorns, and others the leopard, and the like.

And the poor wretches do not perceive with regard to all these things that they are nought; while every day they look upon their gods, who are eaten and destroyed by men, yea even by their own fellows; and some of them being burned, and some of them dying and putrifying and becoming refuse; and they do not understand that they are destroyed in many ways.

And accordingly the Egyptians have not understood that the like of these are not gods, since their salvation is not within their own power; and if they are too weak for their own salvation. then as regards the salvation of their worshippers pray whence will they have the power to help them?

XIII. The Egyptians then have erred with a great error, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth. But it is a matter of wonder, O king, concerning the Greeks, whereas they excel all the rest of the peoples in their manners and in their reason, how thus they have gone astray after dead idols and senseless images: while they see their gods sawn and polished by their makers, and curtailed and cut and burnt and shaped and transformed into every shape by them. And when they are grown old and fail by the length of time, and are melted and broken in pieces, how is it that they do not understand concerning them that they are not gods? And those who have not ability for their own preservation, how will they be able to take care of men? But even the poets and philosophers among them being in error have introduced concerning them that they are gods, things like these which are made for the honour of God Almighty; and being in error they seek to make them like to God as to whom no man has ever seen to whom He is like; nor is

he able to see Him¹; and together with these things they introduce concerning Deity as if it were that deficiency were found with it: in that they say that He accepts sacrifice and asks for burnt-offering and libation and murders of men and temples. But God is not needy, and none of these things is sought for by Him: and it is clear that men are in error in those things that they imagine. But their poets and philosophers introduce and say, <.> that the nature of all their gods is one; but they have not understood of God our Lord, that while He is one, He is yet in all. They, then, are in error: for if, while the body of man is many in its parts, no member is afraid of its fellow, but whilst it is a composite body, all is on an equality with all: so also God who is one in His nature has a single essence proper to Him, and He is equal in His nature and His essence, nor is He afraid of Himself. If therefore the nature of the gods is one, it is not proper that a god should persecute a god, nor kill nor do him that which is evil

If then gods were persecuted and transfixed by gods, and some of them were carried off and some were struck by lightning; it is clear that the nature of their gods is not one, and hence it is clear, O king, that that is an error which they speculate about the nature of their gods, and that they reduce them to one nature. If then it is proper that we should admire a god who is visible and does not see, how much more is this worthy of admiration that a man should believe in a nature which is invisible and all-seeing! and if again it is right that a man should investigate the works of an artificer, how much more is it right that he should praise the Maker of the artificer! For behold! while the Greeks have established laws, they have not understood that by their laws they were condemning their gods; for if their laws are just, their gods are unjust, who have committed transgression in killing one another and practising sorcery, committing adultery, plundering, stealing and sleeping with males, along with the rest of their other doings. But if their gods excellently and as they describe have done all these things, then the laws of the Greeks are unjust; and they are not laid down according to the will of the gods; and in this the whole world has erred.

For as for the histories of their gods, some of them are myths, some of them physical, and some hymns and songs: the hymns and songs, then, are empty words and sound; and as to the physical, if they were done as they say, then they are not gods, since they have done these things and suffered and endured these things: and these myths are flimsy words, altogether devoid of force.

XIV. Let us come now, O king, also to the history of the Jews and let us see what sort of opinion they have concerning God. The Jews then say that God is one, Creator of all and almighty: and that it is not proper for us that anything else should be worshipped, but this God only: and in this they appear to be much nearer to the truth than all the peoples, in that they worship God more exceedingly and not His works; and they imitate God by reason of the love which they have for man; for they have compassion on the poor and ransom the captive and bury the dead, and do things of a similar nature to these: things which are acceptable to God and are well-pleasing also to men, things which they have received from their fathers of old. Nevertheless they too have gone astray from accurate knowledge, and they suppose in their minds that they are serving God, but in the methods of their actions their service is to angels and not to God, in that they observe sabbaths and new moons and the passover and the great fast, and the fast, and circumcision, and cleanness of meats: which things not even thus have they perfectly observed.

XV. Now the Christians, O king, by going about and seeking have found the truth, and as we have comprehended from their writings they are nearer to the truth and to exact knowledge than the rest of the peoples. For they know and believe in God, the Maker of heaven and earth, in whom are all things and from whom are all things: He who has no other god as His fellow: from whom they have received those commandments which they have engraved on their minds, which they keep in the hope and expectation of the world to come; so that on this account they do not commit adultery nor fornication, they do not bear false witness, they do not deny a deposit, nor covet what is not theirs: they honour father and mother; they do good to those who are their neighbours, and when they are judges they judge uprightly; and they do not worship idols in the form of man; and whatever they do not



wish that others should do to them, they do not practise towards any one¹, and they do not eat of the meats of idol sacrifices, for they are undefiled: and those who grieve them they comfort, and make them their friends; and they do good to their enemies: and their wives, O king, are pure as virgins, and their daughters modest: and their men abstain from all unlawful wedlock and from all impurity, in the hope of the recompense that is to come in another world: but as for their servants or handmaids, or their children if any of them have any, they persuade them to become Christians for the love that they have towards them; and when they have become so, they call them without distinction brethren: they do not worship strange gods: and they walk in all humility and kindness, and falsehood is not found among them, and they love one another: and from the widows they do not turn away their countenance: and they rescue the orphan from him who does him violence: and he who has gives to him who has not, without grudging; and when they see the stranger they bring him to their dwellings, and rejoice over him as over a true brother; for they do not call brothers those who are after the flesh, but those who are in the spirit and in God: but when one of their poor passes away from the world, and any of them sees him, then he provides for his burial according to his ability; and if they hear that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs, and if it is possible that he may be delivered, they deliver him.

And if there is among them a man that is poor or needy, and they have not an abundance of necessaries, they fast two or three days that they may supply the needy with their necessary food. And they observe scrupulously the commandments of their Messiah: they live honestly and soberly, as the Lord their God commanded them: every morning and at all hours on account of the goodnesses of God toward them they praise and laud Him: and over their food and over their drink they render Him thanks. And if any righteous person of their number passes away from the world they rejoice and give thanks to God, and they follow his body, as if he were moving from one place to another: and when a child is born to any one of them, they praise God, and if again

1 Cf. Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, cc. 1-4.

H. A.

it chance to die in its infancy, they praise God mightily, as for one who has passed through the world without sins. And if again they see that one of their number has died in his iniquity or in his sins, over this one they weep bitterly and sigh, as over one who is about to go to punishment: such is the ordinance of the law of the Christians, O king, and such their conduct.

XVI. As men who know God, they ask from Him petitions which are proper for Him to give and for them to receive: and thus they accomplish the course of their lives. And because they acknowledge the goodnesses of God towards them, lo! on account of them there flows forth the beauty that is in the world. And truly they are of the number of those that have found the truth by going about and seeking it, and as far as we have comprehended, we have understood that they only are near to the knowledge of the truth.

But the good deeds which they do, they do not proclaim in the ears of the multitude, and they take care that no one shall perceive them, and hide their gift, as he who has found a treasure and hides it. And they labour to become righteous as those that expect to see their Messiah and receive from Him the promises made to them with great glory.

But their sayings and their ordinances, O king, and the glory of their service, and the expectation of their recompense of reward, according to the doing of each one of them, which they expect in another world, thou art able to know from their writings. It sufficeth for us that we have briefly made known to your majesty concerning the conversation and the truth of the Christians. For truly great and wonderful is their teaching to him that is willing to examine and understand it. And truly this people is a new people, and there is something divine mingled with it. Take now their writings and read in them, and lo! ye will find that not of myself have I brought these things forward nor as their advocate have I said them, but as I have read in their writings, these things I firmly believe, and those things also that are to come. And therefore I was constrained to set forth the truth to them that take pleasure therein and seek after the world to come.

And I have no doubt that the world stands by reason of

Matt. xiii. 44.

the intercession of Christians. But the rest of the peoples are deceived and deceivers, rolling themselves before the elements of the world, according as the sight of their understanding is unwilling to pass by them; and they grope as if in the dark, because they are unwilling to know the truth, and like drunken men they stagger and thrust one another and fall down.

XVII. Thus far, O king, it is I that have spoken. For as to what remains, as was said above, there are found in their other writings words which are difficult to speak, or that one should repeat them; things which are not only said, but actually done.

The Greeks, then, O king, because they practise foul things in sleeping with males, and with mother and sister and daughter, turn the ridicule of their foulness upon the Christians; but the Christians are honest and pious, and the truth is set before their eyes, and they are long-suffering; and therefore while they know their error and are buffeted by them, they endure and suffer them: and more exceedingly do they pity them as men who are destitute of knowledge: and in their behalf they offer up prayers that they may turn from their error. And when it chances that one of them turns, he is ashamed before the Christians of the deeds that are done by him: and he confesses to God, saying, In ignorance I did these things: and he cleanses his heart, and his sins are forgiven him, because he did them in ignorance in former time, when he was blaspheming and reviling the true knowledge of the Christians. And truly blessed is the race of the Christians, more than all men that are upon the face of the earth.

Let the tongues of those now be silenced who talk vanity, and who oppress the Christians, and let them now speak the truth. For it is better that they should worship the true God rather than that they should worship a sound without intelligence; and truly divine is that which is spoken by the mouth of the Christians, and their teaching is the gateway of light. Let all those then approach thereunto who do not know God, and let them receive incorruptible words, those which are so always and from eternity: let them, therefore, anticipate the dread judgment which is to come by Jesus the Messiah upon the whole race of men.

The Apology of Aristides the Philosopher is ended.

NOTES ON THE SYRIAC VERSION.

p. 35, l. 4 (<3). We have given in the introductory remarks the reasons for believing that the words <3.0 and <1.3 are a part of the name of the emperor addressed. Both of these words, however, might have been used generally, as royal adjectives. For example, in the recently published Acta Mar Kardaghi of Abbeloos p. 87 they occur as titles of the king of Persia:

which Abbeloos renders by "contra adorabilem regem regum."

[The plural points in these two titles, though obviously wrong, have been retained in our text, in accordance with the principle of reproducing the punctuation of the MS. exactly as it stands. In the first sentence the MS. has a slight stop after ~ 1000 , while there is no stop after ~ 1000 (Almighty' can only be retained as an epithet of the Deity: but possibly there has been some confusion of the original, which may have run: $\pi \epsilon \rho i \theta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon (as' a \dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma \kappa \rho \dot{\sigma} \tau \rho \rho)$, $\kappa \tau \lambda$.]

1. 7 (< 7). The demonstration of Divine Providence from the contemplation of the heavenly bodies is common to all forms of Theistic teaching: consequently it occurs freely in Christian Apologetics. We may compare the following passages:

Melito, Oration to Antoninus Caesar (Cureton, Spic. Syr. p. 46). "He hath set before thee the heavens, and He has placed in them the stars. He hath set before thee the sun and the moon, and they every day fulfil their course therein...He hath set before thee the clouds which by ordinance bring water from above and satisfy the earth: that from these things thou mightest understand, that He who moveth these is greater than they all,

[الخ الملم مداح مع حداهم مهنة مهد]

and that thou mightest accept the goodness of Him who hath given to thee a mind by which thou mayest distinguish these things."

Origen, De Principiis, II. 1. 5. "But that we may believe on the authority of Holy Scripture, that such is the case, hear how in the books of Maccabees,

where the mother of the seven martyrs exhorts her son to endure torture, this truth is confirmed: for she says, 'I ask of thee, my son, to look at the heaven and earth, and at all things which are in them, and beholding them, to know that God made all these things when they did not exist.'" [2 Macc. vii. 28.]

- Id. IV. 1. 7. "The artistic plan of a providential Ruler is not so evident in matters belonging to the earth, as in the case of the sun, moon and stars."
- l. 11 (< 11). Cf. Melito, Oration p. 50. "He made the lights that His works might behold one another, and He concealeth Himself in His might from all His works."
- [l. 11 (\prec 13). If this reading be correct, the Ethpa. seems to be here used in the sense of 'sibi investigare,' of which only one example is cited in the *Thes. Syr.*, viz. from the unpublished Hexaem. of Bar Cephas. The context however of the quotation shews that there at least such a meaning is inadmissible. The words (kindly supplied by Dr Zotenberg)

- ll. 14, 15 (**<** 14, 15). A comparison with the Armenian suggests that something has fallen out here. The Syriac cannot be translated as it stands. The Greek unfortunately fails us at this point.]
- 1. 19 (< 19). The early Christian teachers emphasised strongly this belief that the world was made for the sake of man: consequently we must not assume, if we find the same statement in Justin Martyr, that the idea was borrowed from Aristides, for it is a part of the regular second-century teaching. The following parallels may be quoted:

Justin, Apol. 1. 10. καὶ πάντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀγαθὸν ὅντα δημιουργῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης δι' ἀνθρώπους δεδιδάγμεθα.

Dial. 41. ἵνα ἄμα τε εὐχαριστώμεν τῷ θεῷ ὑπέρ τε τοῦ τὸν κόσμον ἐκτικέναι σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

Ps. Justin, Ep. ad Diogn. 10. ό γὰρ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἢγάπησε, δι' οὖς ἐποίησε τὸν κόσμον, οἶς ὑπέταξε πάντα, κτέ.

23 (= 5). Cf. Philo, Fragments, p. 70: ἐν θεῷ μόνον τὸ τέλειον καὶ ἀνενδεές, ἐν δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ ἐπιδεὲς καὶ ἀτελές.

Id. de Fortitudine § 3. 'Ο σπουδαίος όλιγοδεής, άθανάτου καὶ θνητῆς φύσεως μεθόριος.

Acta Mar Kardaghi (ed. Abbeloos, p. 30):

1. 28 (38). The same philosophical opinion will be found almost in the same words in Eustathius contra Arianos quoted in John of Damascus, Parallels p. 314,

παν την ἀρχην ἔχον, καὶ τελος ἐπιδέχεται' τὸ δὲ τέλος ἐπιδεχόμενον, φθορας ἐστὶ δεκτικόν.

1. 30 (\Rightarrow 10). We may compare the following passages from Justin and from the Epistle to Diognetus, in view of Jerome's statement that Justin imitated Aristides, and the modern theory of Doulcet as to the authorship of the anonymous epistle to Diognetus.

Justin, Apol. I. 9. οὐ γὰρ τοιαύτην ἡγούμεθα τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν τὴν μορφήν, ἥν φασί τινες εἶς τιμὴν μεμιμῆσθαι.

Justin, Apol. II. 6. ὅνομα δὲ τῷ πάντων πατρὶ θετόν, ἀγεννήτῷ ὅντι, οὐκ ἔστιν · ῷ γὰρ ἃν καὶ ὄνομά τι προσαγορεύηται, πρεσβύτερον ἔχει τὸν θέμενον τὸ ὄνομα.

Justin, Dial. 4. φησὶ γὰρ Πλάτων, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, αὐτὸ τοιοῦτον εἶται τὸ τοῦ νοῦ ὅμμα καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο ἡμῖν δεδόσθαι, ὡς δύνασθαι καθορᾶν αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο τὸ τὸ εἰλικρινεῖ αὐτῷ ἐκείνω, ὁ τῶν νοητῶν ἀπάντων ἐστὶν αἴτιον, οὐ χρῶμα ἔχον, οὐ σχῆμα, οὐ μέγεθος, οὐδὲ οὐδὲν ὧν ὀφθαλμὸς βλέπει.

Justin, Apol. I. 10. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δέεσθαι τῆς παρ' ἀνθρώπων ὑλικῆς προσφορᾶς προσειλήφαμεν τὸν θεόν, αὐτὸν παρέχοντα πάντα ὁρῶντες.

Ep. ad Diogn. 3. ὁ γὰρ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν χορηγῶν ὧν προσδεόμεθα, οὐδενὸς ἃν αὐτὸς προσδεόιτο τούτων ὧν τοῖς οἰομένοις διδόναι παρέχει αὐτός.

- [p. 36, l. 13 (Δ 2). ἴδωμεν Gr. (p. 100, l. 16) Arm., εἴδωμεν Syr. A comparison between the Gr. and Syr. shews a like variation in 3 18 (Gr. p. 101, l. 3) and Δ 18 (Gr. p. 104, l. 1).
- 1. 18 (18 8). 'The head of the race of their religion.' This seems to be a conflation of the two phrases which occur lower down: 'the head of their race,' and 'the beginning of their religion.' It should be simply 'the head of their race,' as we see from the Greek.]
- 1. 23 (13). The Armenian has 'Kadmus the Sidonian and Dionysus the Theban.' Cf. Herod. II. 91 τον γάρ Δαναόν καὶ τον Λυγκέα ἐόντας Χεμμίτας ἐκπλῶσαι ἐς τὴν 'Ελλάδα, and II. 49 παρὰ Κάδμου τε τοῦ Τυρίου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ Φοινίκης. But Kadmus is a Sidonian in Eur. Bacch. 171 and Ovid, Met. IV. 571.
- [l. 27 (17). The statement that the people received the name of 'Hebrews' from Moses is peculiar to the Syr. and Arm. translations.]
- 1. 29 (20). The writer not only deduces the name of the Christians from the title of their founder, but he is also ready, like Justin and other

fathers, to compare the name with the Greek word $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\dot{o}s$, as we shall see in the closing chapter. The following parallels may be noted in Justin.

Justin, Apol. I. 12. Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ἀφ' οὖ καὶ τὸ χριστιανοὶ ἐπονομάζεσθαι ἐσχήκαμεν.

Dial. 63. τῆ ἐκκλησία τῆ ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ γενομένη καὶ μετασχούση τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, χριστιανοὶ γὰρ πάντες καλούμεθα.

Ibid. 138. ὁ γὰρ χριστός, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ὤν, καὶ ἀρχὴ πάλιν ἄλλου γένους γέγονεν, τοῦ ἀναγεννηθέντος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δι' ὕδατος καὶ πίστεως καὶ ξύλου, τοῦ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἔχοντος, ὃν τρόπον καὶ ὁ Νῶε κτέ.

l. 32 (23). With the closing words of this sentence we may compare the Syriac Acts of John (ed. Wright), p. 37,

محد بهن جدلم حدة صلم عص محمصد صمه.

where we should correct the text so as to read "and when formed as a child in the womb He was with His Father."

1. 34 (¶ 1). The Gospel is clearly a written one, and not the general message (εὐαγγέλιον). In c. xvi. we again find Aristides offering the Emperor the Christian Scriptures.

[l. 38 (\P 5). The Greek text has καὶ τελέσας τὴν θαυμαστὴν αὐτοῦ οἰκονομίαν. Cf. Justin, *Dial*. 103, and Otto's note on that passage, where the use of οἰκονομία is illustrated. In the Syriac και is unsatisfactory. It can hardly be intended to represent (οἰκονομίαν) τινά. Possibly it is a corruption of some word which corresponded to θαυμαστήν.]

p. 37, l. 1 (3 6). Another instance of the formula 'He was crucified by the Jews,' beyond those to which we have already drawn attention, may be found in a fragment of Melito preserved by Anastasius Sinaita;

'Ο θεὸς πέπονθεν ὑπὸ δεξιᾶς Ἰσραηλίτιδος,

for which the Syriac rendering is given by Cureton, Spic. Syr. 4.

مراهم مراط. هدامه دیمنه المام مراط. مراسم مراط. مراط المام مراط المام ا

In later times we may expect to find similar language, though the expression itself disappears from the Creed. In *Acta Mar Kardaghi* p. 37 we have the following (loquitur Satanas),

ماسم بالم حد معدمه و الاستام و الماسم معدد ... معدد شهد معدد معدد الماسم و الماسم و الماسم و الماسم و الماسم و

and again in p. 74

תביוחמי השמשפון טשי בוע המדדה שיוטעט

The idea of the Jews being the special agents of Satan in the Crucifixion

comes out also in an unpublished 'Αντιλογία between the Devil and Christ, which is preserved in a Ms. at Jerusalem (Cod. 66, S. Sep.), where we read

Καὶ ὁ διάβολος λέγει· Πορεύσομαι πρὸς "Ανναν καὶ Καϊάφαν τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς τοὺς ἐμοὺς Ἰουδαίους· καὶ ποιήσω αὐτοὺς ἵνα σὲ σταυρώσωσι.

[Compare also the Letter of Pilate in the Acts of Peter and Paul § 42 (Tisch. Acta Apocr., Lips. 1851, p. 17): οἱ δὲ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, καὶ ταφέντος αὐτοῦ φύλακας κατέστησαν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ.]

l. 20 ($\mathbf{\pi}$ 25). The injunction to have a care that your gods be not stolen is not uncommon with the early Christians, and it is not improbable that they were able to refer to special and notable cases of violation of temples and mutilation of images. We may refer, at all events, to the following parallels:

Justin, Apol. I. 9. καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἔνθα ἀνατίθενται φύλακας τοιούτους καθιστάναι, μὴ συνορῶντας ἀθέμιτον καὶ τὸ νοεῖν ἢ λέγειν ἀνθρώπους θεῶν εἶναι φύλακας.

Ερ. ad Diogn. 2. τοὺς μὲν λιθίνους καὶ ὀστρακίνους σέβοντες ἀφυλάκτους, τοὺς δὲ ἀργυροῦς καὶ χρυσοῦς ἐγκλείοντες ταῖς νυξὶ καὶ ταῖς ἡμέραις φύλακας παρακαθιστάντες ΐνα μὴ κλαπῶσιν.

l. 26 (co 5). Compare c. VII. From the "Teaching of the Apostles" (c. VI. 3) onwards, idolatry is known as a 'worship of dead gods': e.g. Melito, Oration p. 43, "But I affirm that also the Sibyl has said respecting them, that it is the images of kings, who are dead, they worship."

p. 38, l. 1 (co 19). The writer now proceeds to discuss the views of those who either sought the First Principle in one of the elements or imagined it to be located in one of the heavenly bodies. And it is common for the early Christian writers to demolish the philosophic schools in detail according as they found them referring the origin of all things to water, as Thales; or air, as Anaximenes; or fire, as Heraclitus; or earth, as Pherecydes and Xenophanes. We may compare Plutarch De plucitis philosophorum 1.3, and then notice how the Christian apologists deal with the matter. The writer of the Epistle to Diognetus thinks that, if a god is to be found amongst the elements, one element or created thing is as good as another:

Ερ. ad Diogn. 8. οι μεν πῦρ ἔφασαν εἶναι τὸν θεόν (οὖ μέλλουσι χωρήσειν αὐτοί, τοῦτο καλοῦσι θεόν)· οι δὲ ὕδωρ· οι δ' ἄλλο τι τῶν στοιχείων τῶν ἐκτισμένων ὑπὸ θεοῦ· καίτοιγε, εἴ τις τούτων τῶν λόγων ἀπόδεκτός ἐστι, δύναιτ' ἃν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν κτισμάτων ἐν ἔκαστον ὁμοίως ἀποφαίνεσθαι θεόν.

Melito deals even more shortly with the matter, and in a rude commonsense manner says that we may call a creature God without making it to be divine:

Oration, p. 42. "And if, therefore, a man...say that there is another God, it is found from his own words that he calleth some created thing God. For if a man call fire God, it is not God, because it is fire; and if a man call the waters God, they are not God, because they are waters; and if this earth which we tread upon, and if those heavens which are seen by us, and if the sun, or the moon, or one of those stars which run their course by

ordinance and rest not, nor proceed by their own will—and if a man call gold and silver gods: are not these things that we use as we please?"

It will be seen that their treatment of the subject was superficial, no other treatment being, in fact, necessary. Aristides, however, takes the matter more seriously and examines each case in detail by the light of his previously stated axioms concerning the divine nature.

- [l. 1 (cm 19). ἔλθωμεν Gr., ἐπανέλθωμεν Syr. Comp. also 18 (Gr. p. 104, l. 1).
- 1.36 (10). Koïasa. Probably for Koïasa, examples of which are given under oais in the Thes. Syr.
- p. 39, l. 1 (11). . This phrase, 'your majesty,' does not in any way suggest that more than one person is addressed.
 - 1. 11 (1 20). A probable emendation is べめなごって べめれない.
- 1. 37 (1). Similar language is applied to the heaven in a paragraph found only in the Gr. (p. 101, l. 30) καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν συνεστῶτα διὸ καὶ κόσμος καλεῖται. Where the reference is to man, we should have expected μικρὸς κόσμος. See Suicer, Thes. II. 369 (1728). A treatise was written on this subject (κίαι και και κάται) by Aḥudhemmeh († A.D. 575). See Bibl. Or. III. 1. 194.
- p. 40, ll. 22 ff. (• 2-12). In this classification of the gods of the Greeks the principal points in which the Syr. differs from the Gr. are: (1) ἀδελφοκτόι ους (p. 104, l. 7) is not represented. It is absent also from the Pemb. Coll. MS. of the Greek. (2) After μαινομένους two clauses are inserted, the one taken from the description of Apollo (• 21, 22), and the other from that of Artemis (• 3). (3) An additional clause is inserted after καὶ φυγάδας γενομένους. (4) Two additional clauses, the one taken from the description of Aphrodite (• 15), the other probably from that of Tammuz (• 23), are inserted after the words καὶ κοπτομένους καὶ θρηνουμένους.

It may be remarked that the Greek participles just quoted are both rendered as passives ('wept and lamented by men') by the Syr. translator. The Latin version omits them: the translation of Billyus is: "nonnullos vulnera accepisse, ac lamenta edidisse."]

1. 25 (7). He is referring to Apollo, Poseidon and Asklepios: cf. Tertullian, Apol. 14, Hic Apollinem Admeto regi pascendis pecoribus addicit, ille Neptuni structorias operas Laomedonti locat. Est et illis de lyricis (Pindarum dico) qui Aescolapium canit avaritiae merito, quia medicinam nocenter exercebat, fulmine iudicatum.

p. 41, l. 20 (14. Gr. p. 104, l. 22). The Syr. supports neither $\tilde{o}\pi\omega s$ nor \tilde{o} $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau os.]$

1. 21 (15). The translator gives the Syriac name for Saturn, in the Classical Review for June 1890, p. 259, Prof. Margoliouth reviewing Budge's Pseudo-Callisthenes remarks as follows, "On p. 9 after the name of each planet we are told what the Persian for it is: surely this implies that the book which the translator had before him was in Persian. I will quote one of these, because Mr Budge has by accident missed the truth. The name of Saturn is omitted from the list, but instead we read, the colour of a black stone, and the horoscopus of helani which is called in Persian Farnug. Mr Budge would emend Farnug', but it is a Persian word signifying Saturn..... Hence 'colour' must stand for a word signifying Saturn; and this will be the Persian which the translator has read 'colour'."

Justin, Apol. I. 21. πόσους γὰρ υίοὺς φάσκουσι τοῦ Διὸς οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν τιμώμενοι συγγραφεῖς, ἐπίστασθε· Ἑρμῆν μέν, λόγον τὸν ἐρμηνευτικὸν καὶ πάντων διδάσκαλον, ᾿Ασκληπιὸν δέ, καὶ θεραπευτὴν γενόμενον, κεραυνωθέντα ἀνεληλυθέναι εἰς οὐρανόν, Διόνυσον δὲ διασπαραχθέντα, Ἡρακλέα δὲ φυγῆ πόνων ἑαυτὸν πυρὶ δόντα, τοὺς ἐκ Λήδας δὲ Διοσκούρους, καὶ τὸν ἐκ Δανάης Περσέα,...

Justin, Apol. I. 25. θ εφ δὲ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀπαθεῖ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνεθήκαμεν, ὃν οὔτε ἐπ' ᾿Αντιόπην καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὁμοίως οὐδὲ ἐπὶ Γανυμήδην δι οἶστρον ἐληλυθέναι πειθόμεθα.

Recog. Clement. x. 22. "Antiopen Nyctei versus in Satyrum corrupit: ex qua nascuntur Amphion et Zethus; Alcmenam, mutatus in virum eius Amphitryonem; ex qua nascitur Hercules: Aeginam Asopi, mutatus in aquilam, ex qua nascitur Aeacus. Sed et Ganymedem Dardani mutatus nihilominus in aquilam stuprat; Mantheam Phoci, mutatus in ursum; ex qua nascitur Arctos: Danaen Acrisii, mutatus in aurum; ex qua nascitur Perseus: Europen Phoenicis, mutatus in taurum; ex qua nascitur Minos, et Rhadamanthus Sarpedonque: Eurymedusam Achelai, mutatus in formicam;

ex qua nascitur Myrmidon: Thaliam Aetnam nympham, mutatus in vulturem; ex qua nascuntur apud Siciliam Palixi: Imandram Geneani apud Rhodum, mutatus in imbrem: Cassiopiam, mutatus in virum eius Phoenicem; ex qua nascitur Anchinos: Ledam Thesti, mutatus in cycnum; ex qua nascitur Helena: et iterum eandem, mutatus in stellam; ex qua nascuntur Castor et Pollux: Lamiam, mutatus in upupam: Mnemosynen, mutatus in pastorem; ex qua nascuntur Musae novem: Nemesin, mutatus in anserem: Semelen Cadmiam mutatus in ignem; ex qua nascitur Dionysus," etc.

See also Ps. Justin, Oratio ad Gentiles = Ambrose, Hypomnemata (Cureton, Spic. Syr. pp. 63, 64) for a similar sketch to that of Aristides.

- [l. 4 () Pasiphae is an erroneous insertion in the Syriac.
- 6 (ユ 13). κία seems to be an attempt to render σάτυρον. In the Syriac of Ambrose (Spic. Syr. 16) the Greek word is transliterated.
- 1. 7 (ユ 14). Υ່ταν . Our translator seems to have read ΣΕΛΗΝΗΣ for ΣΕΜΕΛΗΣ.
- - 1. 18 (6. Gr. p. 105, l. 15). τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν Codd. AW. Syr.
- 1. 30 (16). mrin Kana nam in the Syr. alone. Comp. 'cum pilleo Vulcanus et malleo.' Arnob. adv. nat. vi. 12.]
- l. 31 (17). For the ornaments made by Hephaestus, and sarcastic Christian remarks thereon, we may cite

Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos, c. VIII. 'Ο γὰρ ἀμφιγυήτις, ὡς εἰκός, ὁ πόρπας καὶ γναμπτὰς ἔλικας δημιουργῶν τοῖς κοροκοσμίοις ἢπάτησε τὴν ἀμήτορα παῖδα καὶ ὀρφανήν (sc. 'Αθηνᾶν).

- [1. 37 (בעל), 'maimed.' The Greek has κυλλόν: but it is an impossible epithet for Hermes. The corruption however must have been a very early one. The Pembroke College MS. has δόλιον as a suggestion in the margin; but this is merely a conjectural emendation of the seventeenth century. The Latin version has 'uersipellem.' Probably κυλλόν has slipped in from the description of Hephaestus just above. It may be noted however that 'versipellis' = פִוּלְטָה Prov. xiv. 25, Vulg., where the LXX. has δόλιος, which is elsewhere used as an epithet of Hermes. If therefore the Latin really represents a Greek word, and is not a mere guess, δόλιον would seem to be appropriate, and it is not very unlike κυλλόν.
- **raino** ('and an athlete'). An addition in the Syr., referring to Hermes as the inventor of the palaestra. Comp. 'curat Mercurius ceromas, pugillatibus et luctationibus praeest,' Arnob. adv. nat. III. 23.

p. 43, l. 7 (🖚 11). The Syr. read Λακεδαίμονα or Λακεδαιμόνιον and omitted νίον.

l. 25 (\mathbf{ca} 7). \dot{v} πὸ τ ῶν Τιτάνων. Comp. Arnob. adv. nat. I. 41, v. 19. The Syr. has the singular.

p. 44, l. 1 (m. 21, 22). **Examo Kiduo**, lit. 'a cithara, and a striker' (cf. 5). This last word might mean the 'plectrum'; or it might mean another musical instrument. Cf. Arnob. adv. nat. vi. 12, 'cum plectro et fidibus Delius.'

The Greek has $\kappa\iota\theta\acute{a}\rho\alpha\nu$ καὶ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha$ (or $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha$, or $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha$). The emendations $\pi\lambda\eta\kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha$ and $\pi\eta\kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha$ have little to commend them. The Latin version has 'tibiam.']

I. 31 (5). [The paragraph on Rhea and the following one on Proserpine are not in the Greek.] The Fathers not infrequently allude to the myth of Rhea and Atys. [Cf. Tatian, ad Graecos, 8, 'Pέα μὲν γάρ, ἡν οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Φρυγίων ὀρῶν Κυβέλην φασίν,...διὰ τὸν ἐρώμενον ταύτης "Αττιν.]

As to the establishment of dances in honour of Atys, these are a characteristic feature of Semitic orginatic worship. One of the best illustrations is the temple of Baal-Marcod, which stands on a spur of the Lebanon above Beyrout, and where there are many inscriptions from the ancient temple built into the walls of a modern convent. The name implies Lord of Dances and in one inscription given by Waddington (Inser. Syr. No. 1855) is directly paraphrased as $\kappa oi\rho ave$ $\kappa \omega \mu \omega v$.

[p. 45, l. 11 (.... 2). Kind the Syriac alone, taken from the formula in l. 9.]

l. 22 (13). According to our apologist Isis fled to Byblos in Syria; and this agrees with Plutarch *De Iside et Osiride*, that Byblos was a sanctuary of Isis; now we know from Lucian *De Dea Syra* c. 6 that the great sanctuary at Byblos was a sanctuary of Aphrodite $B\nu\beta\lambda\dot{\eta}$ (cf. Strabo xvi. 2, p. 362 $B\dot{\nu}\beta\lambda\sigma = A\delta\dot{\omega}\nu\delta\sigma$ ($\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}$). We should therefore have to assume that

Byblos was the centre at once of an Isis-cult and an Aphrodite-cult which is the same thing as an Astarte-cult, for our apologist tells us to equate the Greek Aphrodite to the Syrian Astera. We must then assume either that the two forms of worship existed side by side, or that there had been a fusion of the two cults, the latter hypothesis being favoured by the similarity between the case of Aphrodite weeping for Tammuz and Isis lamenting Osiris. Moreover the confusion extends to the personalities of Osiris and Adonis: and Movers quotes from Stephanus of Byzantium as follows: ᾿Αμαθοῦς πόλις Κύπρου ἀρχαιοτάτη, ἐν ἢ Ἅδῶνις ϶Οσιρις ἐτιμᾶτο ὃν Αἰγύπτιον ὅντα Κύπριοι καὶ Φοίνικες ἰδιοποιοῦντο.

Whether, then, we pay attention to the dead gods or the wailing goddesses, there is a great similarity in the matter of the two religions. And we have suggested that in the sanctuary at Byblos the two cults may have been carried on side by side. One other question suggests itself, viz. whether they may not both be modifications of some earlier worship. We have some reason for believing that the original Byblos-worship was that of the Assyrian Baaltis, for Philo Byblius says that this city was the gift of Cronos to Baaltis. Now this Baaltis, the Assyrian mother of the gods, appears in the west in a Greek form, first under the name of Mylitta by a common change in the pronunciation of b and m. But this Mylitta is affirmed by Herodotus to be capable of equation with Aphrodite (I. 131 καλέουσι δὲ ᾿Ασσύριοι τὴν ᾿Αφροδίτην Μύλιττα) and this would lead us to recognize in the sanctuary at Byblos an original sanctuary of Mylitta.

[p. 46, l. 2 () 6). We should probably read **Example 19.** and transfer to the preceding clause.]

1. 3 (, 7). The local variation in the Egyptian worship appears in Herodotus and is alluded to by the Christian fathers:

Herod. II. 69. τοῖσι μὲν δὴ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἱροί εἰσι οἱ κροκόδειλοι, τοῖσι δὲ οὔ, ἀλλὰ ἄτε πολεμίους περιέπουσι.

Justin, Apol. 1. 24. ἄλλων ἀλλαχοῦ καὶ δένδρα σεβομένων καὶ ποταμοὺς καὶ μῦς καὶ αἰλούρους καὶ κροκοδείλους καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων τὰ πολλά.

Recog. Clement. v. 20. "Nam alii eorum bovem qui Apis dicitur colendum tradidere, alii hircum; alii gattas; nonnulli ibin; quidam serpentem; piscem quoque, et caepas et cloacas, crepitus ventris, pro numinibus habendos esse docuerunt: et alia innumerabilia quae pudet etiam nominare."

[See Mayor's notes to Juv. Sat. xv., for a storehouse of references on this point.]

Of the objects of worship mentioned by Aristides, some are rather difficult to identify. The first question that arises is with regard to the animal denoted by

مراقه مهمد سامية

The word therefore stands for a cat. The fable to which we have referred is

No. 40 in Landsberger's Fabeln des Sophos. The Syriac reference is due to Prof. Bensly.

[Kiaix = aïλουροs occurs in Lagarde's Geop. 116. 19 (Gr. xiv. 4), and the form Kiax in Geop. 114. 22 (Gr. xiv. 15).]

Twice there is an allusion to sacred fish, once in a general manner, where we should perhaps correct \prec to \prec to \prec thus placing the dove with the rest of the sacred birds; and once in a special manner where the name of the fish is given as Shibbuta. What fish is this? Is it the same as the $\lambda \epsilon \pi \iota \delta \omega \tau \delta s$ of Herodotus (II. 72)?

νομίζουσι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἰχθύων τὸν καλεύμενον λεπιδωτὸν ἱρὸν εἶναι καὶ τὴν ἔγχελυν.

The name of the fish is found in the Arabic Lexicons as and in Freytag it is described as being like a shad (alosa) but three times larger, and is said to be exported from the Euphrates to Aleppo. Cf. Levy, Neuhebrüisches und Chaldüisches Wörterbuch, IV. pp. 496, 678.

For a similar account of this fish we may refer to a note by Kosegarten in Z. D. M. G. IV. 249. Kosegarten merely quotes the Kamus and Freytag, but an editorial note adds that the fish in question is the Latin *rhombus*, i.e. the turbot.

[κία] το, 'silurus,' 'the shad-fish' (cf. Mayor's note on Juv. Sat. IV. 32). This comes in somewhat inappropriately: and it may have arisen from a misreading of αἴλουρος. 'The cat' however is represented lower down by

- and indeed it is repeated later on, 'the fish Shibbuta.' It would be easy to emend a, 'the dove'; but all the birds are of the ravenous type. There is just a possibility that a may have been the original word. It occurs in the Pesh. Vers. of Levit. xi. 17, where the corresponding word in the A. V. is 'the cormorant.'
- 1. 14 (λ. 18). Δασθάις σ. The Syriac translator read έταίρων for έτέρων.]
- l. 27 (6). Here the language may be illustrated by a reference to Justin, Apol. I. 9, τί γὰρ δεῖ εἰδόσιν ὑμῖν λέγειν ἃ τὴν ὕλην οἱ τεχνῖται διατιθέασι ξέοντες καὶ τέμνοντες καὶ χωνεύοντες καὶ τύπτοντες; and Ep. ad Diogn. 2, οὐχ ὃ μὲν αὐτῶν λιθοξόος, ὃ δὲ χαλκεύς, ὃ δὲ ἀργυροκόπος, ὃ δὲ κεραμεὺς ἔπλασεν;
- [p. 47, l. 20 (\sim 15, 16). Our translator has evidently taken $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \nu \sigma \omega \lambda \sigma \gamma ' i a \nu$ in the sense of 'the counting of the natures of the gods.']
- p. 49, 1. 1 (21). The description given of the Christians in this chapter recalls in many points the "Teaching of the Apostles." To begin with, we have the golden rule in a negative form, which may be compared with the first chapter of the Teaching, and with a similar Syriac sentence

given as a saying of Menander in Land, Anecdota 1. 69, from Cod. Mus. Britt. 14658, fol. 166 r, as follows:

which is a very different rendering from that of Aristides, and may be suspected from its ascription to Menander to be a translation of some metrical form of the golden rule.

The version in Aristides, from its setting in the text of the Apology, between two precepts against idolatry, viz. idols in the form of man, and meats offered to idols, reminds one of the Codex Bezae which completes the rule of the Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 29) by adding the words

καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε έαυτοῖς γείνεσθαι, έτέρω μὴ ποιεῖν.

But whether the sentence stood in this connexion in the primitive Didascalia, we cannot say.

Other parallels will suggest themselves, as when Aristides describes Christian practice in words that seem to answer to

ου μοιχεύσεις, ου πορνεύσεις, ου ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, ουκ αποστερήσεις, ουκ επιθυμήσεις τα τοῦ πλησίου,

which does not differ much from c. II. of the Teaching. The parallelisms, however, are only just sufficient to suggest an acquaintance with the Teaching on the part of Aristides; and his whole presentation of Christian ethics is vastly superior to anything in the Didaché, and can only be paralleled for beauty and spirituality in the pages of Tertullian.

- [l. 3 (ユニ 1) ܡܪܫܝܐ, 'they comfort.' This is a mistranslation of the Greek word παρακαλοῦσιν, which in this place clearly means not 'to comfort,' but 'to exhort.']
- p. 50, l. 37 (AA 17). The belief that the world stands by reason of the Christians occurs also in the following passages:

Justin, Apol. I. 45. εως αν...συντελέσθη ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων, δι' ους καὶ μηδέπω τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν πεποίηται.

Justin, Apol. II. 7. ὅθεν καὶ ἐπιμένει ὁ θεὸς τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ κατάλυσιν τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου μὴ ποιῆσαι...διὰ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν χριστιανῶν, ὁ γινώσκει ἐν τῆ φύσει ὅτι αἴτιὸν ἐστιν.

Ep. ad Diogn. 6. χριστιανοί κατέχονται μέν ώς έν φρουρά τῷ κόσμῳ, αὐτοί δὲ συνέχουσι τὸν κόσμον.

The extract from the Epistle to Diognetus is nearer to the idea of Aristides than the passages quoted from Justin.

- [l. 37 (as 17). ... als : κλαζω ω λωα. An instance of the so-called pleonastic negative retained from the Greek. Cf. Plato Hip. min. 369 D ἐγώ τοι οὖκ ἀμφισβητῶ μὴ οὖχὶ σὲ εἶναι σοφώτερον ἡ ἐμέ.]
- p. 51, l. 2 (as 19). The expression which we have rendered "rolling themselves," occurs again in Melito, Oration (Cureton, Spic. Syr. p. 4s, 25),

حدیم حداد که مده کا موموس مدله . ام در مداری مداری در مداری در مداری در کاری در

("Why rollest thou thyself upon the earth, and offerest supplication to things which are without perception?")

[l. 13 (24) 7). (ridicule, 'scorn.' This word seems often to be confused with (horror, which occurs as a variant for it, 2 Pet. ii. 18 (compare the Urmi edition of 1846 and the New York edition of 1886): cf. 4 Macc. 14. 1.]

36 (3). The concluding words may be compared with Justin Dial. 58, ἐν ἦπερ μέλλει κρίσει διὰ τοῦ κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων θεὸς ποιεῖσθαι.

It will be seen that we have given especial attention to the illustrations furnished to the text of our author by the undoubted writings of Justin and by the Epistle to Diognetus. We have not, however, been able to agree with the opinion of Doulcet in reference to the latter writing, nor with the tradition of Jerome in reference to Justin's imitation of Aristides. It may, however, be taken for granted, from the parallels adduced, that Justin and Aristides are nearly contemporary.

APPENDIX

THE REMAINS OF THE ORIGINAL GREEK

OF

THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES

BX

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON M.A.

FELLOW AND ASSISTANT TUTOR OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE



THE ORIGINAL GREEK OF THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES.

While Mr Harris was passing the preceding pages through the press, he kindly allowed me to read the proof sheets of his translation of the Syriac. Shortly afterwards as I was turning over Latin Passionals at Vienna in a fruitless search for a lost MS. of the Passion of S. Perpetua, I happened to be reading portions of the Latin Version of the 'Life of Barlaam and Josaphat,' and presently I stumbled across words which recalled the manner and the thought of Aristides. Turning back to the beginning of a long speech, I found the words: 'Ego, rex, providentia Dei veni in mundum; et considerans celum et terram, mare et solem et lunam, et cetera, admiratus sum ornatum eorum.' The Greek text of 'Barlaam and Josaphat' is printed in Migne's edition of the works of S. John of Damascus: and it was not long before I was reading the actual words of the Apologist himself: Έγω, βασιλεῦ, προνοία θεοῦ ἦλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ θεωρήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ γην καὶ θάλασσαν, ηλιόν τε καὶ σελήνην καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, ἐθαύμασα την διακόσμησιν τούτων. It was with some impatience that I waited for my return to Cambridge, in order to examine the proof sheets again, and so to discover by a comparison of the Syriac Version how much of our author was really in our hands in the original tongue.

To what extent then does the Greek speech in 'Barlaam and Josaphat' correspond to the Syriac Version of the Apology of Aristides? In other words: How far may we claim to have recovered the original Apology in the language in which it was written?

The circumstances under which the Greek has been preserved at all demand first a brief notice. 'The Life of Barlaam and

Joasaph (or Josaphat)' is the title of a religious romance, which, by a tradition dating at the latest from the 11th century, has been connected with the name of S. John of Damascus. It is true that SS. Barlaam and Josaphat find a place in the Calendars of both the Eastern and Western Churches: but it has long been recognised that their 'Life' is a working up of the Indian legend of Sakya Mouni, or Buddha; and a number of the apologues scattered over the piece have also been identified as Eastern stories of a very early date.

The popularity of the book has rarely been equalled in the history of literature. Before the 13th century it had been translated into almost every known language of the world; an Icelandic Version was made about the year 1200 by the order of a Norwegian king; and there is an early English rendering in metre.

It has lately been argued, and I think with success, by Zotenberg¹, that the book is much earlier than the time of S. John of Damascus; and that the matter which it has in common with several of his works is drawn from previous writers such as Gregory Nazianzen and Nemesius. This being so, it may well go back to the 6th century, or perhaps earlier still.

The outline of the story is as follows. An Eastern king, named Abenner, persecutes the Christians, and especially the monks, whom he expels from India. He is childless; but at length the young prince Josaphat is born, and the astrologers, as in the case of Buddha, predict for him an extraordinary greatness. They add however that he will become a Christian. This his father determines to prevent. He encloses him in a magnificent palace; allows none but young and beautiful attendants to approach him; and forbids the mention of sorrow, disease and death, and above all of Christianity. When the prince is grown to man's estate he asks his father to give him liberty. His entreaties are at length successful, as it seems that otherwise his life will be saddened, and the first step will have been taken towards his reception of the forbidden faith. He is allowed to drive out, but the way, is carefully prepared beforehand, and guarded from the

¹ Notice sur le livre de Barlaam et Joasaph, Paris, 1886. A useful summary of the literature on 'B. and J.' is given by Krumbacher in Iwan von Müller's Handbuch der alt. Wissensch. vol. 9, pt. 1, p. 469.

intrusion of sad sights and sounds. At last precaution fails, and he sees one day a lame man and a blind man, and another day a man wrinkled and tottering with age. He inquires whether accidents may befal any man, and whether every man must come at last to miserable old age or death. There is but one answer: and the joy has fled from his life.

A monk of the desert, Barlaam by name, is divinely warned of the prince's condition; and comes disguised as a merchant, and obtains entrance to the prince to shew him a most goodly pearl. In a long discourse, into which Gospel parables and Eastern apologues are skilfully woven, he expounds to him the vanity of the world and the Christian hope of the life to come. In the end the prince is baptized, and Barlaam disappears into the desert. The king, distracted with rage on the one hand and love for his son on the other, casts about for means to shake his faith. A wily counsellor propounds a plan. An old man, who closely resembles Barlaam and who is an admirable actor, is to defend the cause of Christianity in an open debate. He is to make a lame speech, and be easily refuted by the rhetoricians. The prince, seeing his instructor baffled, will renounce his newly accepted faith.

The day comes, and Nachor, for this is the old man's name, appears to personate Barlaam. Josaphat addresses him in vigorous terms, reminding him of the difficulties in which his instructions have involved him, and promising him a miserable fate if he fails to prove his point. Nachor is not reassured by this mode of address; but after some preliminary fencing on the part of the rhetoricians he begins to speak. Such, says our author, was the providence of God, that like Balaam of old he had come to curse, but he ended by blessing with manifold blessings. Or, as he says again, lowering his metaphor; 'He beckoned to the multitude to keep silence, and he opened his mouth, and like Balaam's ass he spake that which he had not purposed to speak; and he said to the king: I, O king, by the providence of God came into the world....'

The Apology of Aristides carried the day: and, to cut the long story short, Nachor himself and finally the king and his people were converted: and at last Josaphat, who in due course succeeds

his father, resigns his kingdom and retires to spend his days with Barlaam in the desert¹.

What modifications then were required to fit the Apology for its new surroundings? Surprisingly few.

- (1) The king is of course addressed throughout: but this is so in the original piece. Only a short sentence at the end praises the wise choice of the king's son.
- (2) The fourfold division of mankind into Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians, was out of place in an Indian court. We find in its stead a triple division—Worshippers of false gods, Jews and Christians: and the first class is subdivided into Chaldeans, Greeks and Egyptians, as being the ringleaders and teachers of heathenism to the rest of the world².
- (3) A short passage at the close, in which the Christians are defended from the foul charges so often brought against them in the first days, was out of date and consequently has disappeared.
- (4) If we add to this that there are traces of compression here and there, and that the description of the Christians at the close is considerably curtailed, we have exhausted the list of substantial modifications which can with certainty be detected.

The substance of the Apology then is for the most part faithfully preserved: but can we say that with the exceptions already named we have the actual Greek words of Aristides himself?

The first and most obvious test to apply is that of comparative length. The Syriac is, speaking roughly, half as long again as the Greek: and this difference is not fully accounted for by the combination in the latter of the preliminary statements about the Jews and the Christians with the fuller descriptions of them given later on, and by the omission of nearly two pages at the close.

¹ A small fragment (below, p. 104), which is omitted from its proper place in Nachor's speech, is embodied in an early part of the book (Bois. p. 49). We thus see that the writer had the Apology before him at the outset of his work, and designed his plot with the definite intention of introducing it.

² See, however, below, p. 90; where reasons are given which tend to shew that the Greek has preserved the original triple division, as against the Syriac and the Armenian.

The fact is that the Syriac has a large number of repetitions and not a few additional details which are absent from the Greek. Thus at the end of each description of the several gods and goddesses of the heathen, the Syriac Version points the moral and drives home the inevitable conclusion: and again such histories as those of Kronos and of Isis and Osiris are somewhat more elaborately told in this form of the Apology.

Are we then to conclude that the Syriac translator has enlarged upon his original, and supplemented it here and there from his own resources? Or must we say that the author of 'Barlaam and Josaphat' found the Apology too long for his purpose, and pruned away unnecessary details?

The second hypothesis has a prima facie probability, and the general reputation for faithfulness of Syriac translators might point us in the same direction. On the other side it is to be observed that, even when read in the light of the Syriac Version, the Greek form is still felt to be a harmonious and consistent whole: and it certainly does not convey the impression of serious mutilation. The genius of the author, in so framing his plot as perfectly to suit the Apology which he intended to introduce, needs no further praise than is involved in the fact that hitherto no one has had the remotest suspicion that he did not write the speech of Nachor himself. If anything could make his genius appear more extraordinary still, it would be the proof that he had consistently compressed the original document in almost every alternate sentence without leaving any traces of rough handling: but such proof is at present not forthcoming. In the absence of further documents, the question must be decided largely by internal evidence and the minute investigation of the points of difference. But there are two external sources from which light may be thrown upon the problem.

(1) In 1855 Cureton published in his Spicilegium Syriacum a treatise bearing the title: 'Hypomnemata, which Ambrose, a chief man of Greece, wrote;' and commencing with the words: 'Do not suppose, men and Greeks, that without fit and just cause is my separation from your customs.' These words are the literal translation of the opening sentence of the Oratio ad

Gentiles traditionally ascribed to Justin Martyr: Μὴ ὑπολάβητε, Το ἄνορες Έλληνες, ἄλογον ἢ ἀνεπίκριτον εἶναί μου τὸν ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων ἐθῶν χωρισμόν.

When we compare the original Greek with the Syriac Version of this document, we find that in point of length they stand to one another exactly as do the Greek and Syriac forms of the Apology of Aristides: that is to say, in either case the Syriac is about half as long again as the Greek. Moreover, as in the case of our Apology, the variation begins to shew itself immediately after the first sentence, which I have quoted. For the Greek continues thus: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς εὖρον ὅσιον ἢ θεοφιλές. αὐτὰ γὰρ τὰ τῶν ποιητών ύμων συνθέματα λύσσης καὶ ἀκρασίας ἐστὶ μνημεῖα, τω γάρ ἐν παιδεία παρ' ὑμῖν προύχοντι φοιτών τις πάντων ἀνθρώπων έστιν άργαλεώτατος. πρώτιστα μέν γάρ φασι τὸν Αγαμέμνονα, $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. But the Syriac replaces this by the following, as Cureton renders it: 'For I have investigated the whole of your wisdom of poetry, and rhetoric, and philosophy; and when I found not anything right or worthy of the Deity, I was desirous of investigating the wisdom of the Christians also, and of learning and seeing who they are, and when, and what is this its recent and strange production, or on what good things they rely who follow this wisdom, so as to speak the truth. Men and Greeks, when I had made the enquiry I found not any folly, as in the famous Homer, who says respecting the wars of the two rivals, "for the sake of Helen many of the Greeks perished at Troy, far from their beloved home." For first they say respecting Agamemnon,' &c.

Here then we have a similar problem to that of the Apology of Aristides; and in this case we are not hampered by the consideration that the Greek may possibly have been abbreviated to fit it for incorporation into a religious novel. Few will be disposed to challenge the verdict of Otto¹, that the Syriac translator has so altered and amplified his original as almost to have produced a new work.

We may give one more illustration of the manner in which the translator has proceeded. We have seen already that he has paraded at the outset his independent acquaintance with Homer.

¹ Justini Opera, tom. 2, p. xxix.

Where Ulysses is alluded to, later on, the Greek has a sentence full of satire and liable to be misunderstood. 'Ο γὰρ Ἰθακήσιος Λαερτιάδης ἐκ κακίας ἀρετὴν ἐνεπορεύσατο' ὅτι δὲ ἀγαθῆς φρονήσεως ἄμοιρος ἦν, ὁ κατὰ τὰς Σειρῆνας διάπλους ἐδήλωσεν, ὅτε μὴ ἢδυνήθη φρονήσει ἐμφράξαι τὴν ἀκοήν. Corresponding to this we find in the Syriac Version: 'But respecting the guile of Odysseus, son of Laertes, and his murders, who shall tell? For to a hundred and ten suitors in one day his house was a grave, and was filled with dead bodies and blood. And he it is that by his wickedness purchased praises, because by the excellence of his wisdom he was concealed: and he it is that, as ye say, sailed over the sea, and heard the voice of the Sirens, because he stopped his ears with wax.'

The translator then has first supplemented his author by introducing fresh details about Ulysses: and then he has totally missed the meaning of the Greek. He has obviously read it as if it were δι ἀγαθῆς φρονήσεως ἀμανρὸς ἦν, 'through the excellence of his wisdom he kept himself in the dark.' Then not seeing the point of φρονήσει ἐμφράξαι, he simply tells us that 'he stopped his ears with wax.' This of course the hero did not do: and the translator has got the Homeric story wrong: nor shall we mend matters much by inserting with Cureton the word 'not' after 'and heard.' We see at any rate plainly enough what was this Syrian's conception of a translator's function when his author seemed obscure.

The parallel between the two Apologies is the more striking, because the line of argument in these Hypomnemata vividly recalls parts of Aristides, and the same illustrations of the misdemeanours of the gods frequently reappear in almost the same language. The satire of the so-called Ambrosius is a much keener weapon than the simple narrative of Aristides: but there is not the same intensity of moral earnestness. It is quite credible that the later Apologist had the work of Aristides before him when he wrote, and endeavoured to reproduce the same arguments in what he thought was a more telling manner. Thus he says: ἀνάγνωτε τῷ Διτ, ἄνδρες Ἔλληνες, τὸν κατὰ πατρολφῶν νόμον καὶ τὸ μοιχείας πρόστιμον καὶ τὴν παιδεραστίας αἰσχρότητα (cf. infra p. 109, l. 7). And again: Τί σεμνὸν ἐπιδείκνυται γυνὴ ὅπλοις κεκοσμημένη, κ.τ.λ.

(cf. p. 106, l. 24). And once more: Θέτω τὸν ζῆλον "Ηφαιστος, καὶ μὴ φθονείτω, εἰ πρεσβύτης ὢν καὶ κυλλὸς τὸν πόδα μεμίσητο, "Αρης δὲ πεφίλητο νέος ὢν καὶ ώραῖος (cf. p. 105, l. 18).

Enough then has been said to shew that a Syriac translator, finding an early Greek Apology and desiring to reproduce it in his own language, might have no scruple whatever in dealing very freely with his author, in expunging sentences which he was not able or did not care to translate, and in supplementing the original here and there out of his own resources. The Syriac translator of the Oratio ad Gentiles has clearly so treated his unknown author; and this fact removes any a priori objection to the supposition that the Syriac translator of Aristides has acted in a similar way.

(2) We are fortunate in having an additional source of evidence in the Armenian fragment which contains the opening sentences of the Apology. The Armenian translator has clearly done what we have had some reason to suspect in the case of the Syriac translator. He has dealt freely with his original, adding words and even sentences, and introducing the stock phrases of a later theology. But this, while it diminishes very considerably the amount of the evidence which can be produced from his version, does not materially affect its value as far as it goes. Phrases which are only found in the Armenian, or only found in the Syriac, may be dismissed as possibly the inventions of the respective translators: but there remains a considerable quantity of matter common to the two Versions, which therefore presupposes a Greek original. The question we have to ask is: What is the relation of this common matter to the Greek text now in our hands?

A preliminary point however demands attention: Is the Armenian translated from the Syriac, or is it an independent translation made directly or indirectly from the Greek itself?

A few instances in which the Armenian corresponds with the

A few instances in which the Armenian corresponds with the Greek against the Syriac will suffice to shew that it cannot come from the Syriac as we now have it.

In the opening sentence we have $\pi\rho\rho\nu\rho\dot{\rho}$ and 'providentia' (Arm.) against 'goodness' (Syr.). Immediately afterwards $\sigma\epsilon\lambda\dot{\eta}\nu\eta\nu$ and 'luna' (Arm.), which the Syriac omits. Lower down 'rectorem'

three times corresponds to parts of $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\hat{\imath}\nu$, but there is nothing to answer to these in the Syriac. In the Christological passage near the end of the fragment, 'una cum Spiritu Sancto' (Arm.) answers to $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\dot{\nu}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\iota}\varphi$: and here again the Syriac has no equivalent.

Moreover in the description of the Divine nature the Armenian Version says: 'Ei neque colores sunt neque forma,' or as Mr Conybeare renders it 'Colour and form of Him there is not.' This corresponds to the Syriac phrase: 'He has no likeness, nor composition of members.' The Greek fails us here: but we may suppose that the Greek word which has been variously rendered 'colour' and 'likeness' was $\chi\rho\hat{\omega}\mu a$, as in the passage quoted by Mr Harris from Justin (supra p. 54): où $\chi\rho\hat{\omega}\mu a$ ě $\chi o v$, où $\sigma \chi\hat{\eta}\mu a$.

We may conclude then that the Armenian Version is not made from the Syriac Version in its present form¹: and similar arguments could be adduced, if there were any necessity, to shew that the Syriac Version is independent of the Armenian.

I have mentioned already almost all the cases in which the Syriac fails to reproduce in any form matter which is common to the Greek and the Armenian. They scarcely make up between them more than a dozen words. The additional matter found only in the Syriac Version is more considerable.

First, there is the second title which introduces the name of Antoninus Pius, and so conflicts with the first which has the support of the Armenian².

Then we have the following phrases:

- (a) Who is hidden in them and concealed from them: and this is well known, that...
- ¹ See however p. 90, where the fourfold division of mankind, common to Syr. and Arm., is further criticised.
- ² Mr Harris inclines to accept this second title of the Syriac Version as the true one: see above, pp. 7 ff. But the course of the present argument tends to shew that the Syriac translator has introduced many arbitrary changes on his own account: and this makes me the more unwilling to accept his testimony against that of the Armenian Version, which has moreover the explicit statement of Eusebius to support it. The circumstances under which the Greek has been preserved to us necessitated the omission of the title altogether; so that no direct evidence on the point reaches us from that quarter.

- (b) And in saying that He is complete, I mean that there is no deficiency in Him.
 - (c) And that which has an end is dissoluble.
 - (d) From man He asks nothing.
 - (e) Who begat...from whom was born...who begat.
 - (f) Of their religion (bis).
- (g) And it is said that (in the Christological statement)... and clad Himself with...and they say that...who are well known.

I have taken no account of the many places in which the two Versions wander far from each other, and yet seem to have some common basis. Here the Armenian is obviously the worst offender, and its interpolations are far more numerous.

We now turn to the Greek itself in the passage covered by the Armenian fragment, in order to see first of all to what extent what we actually have faithfully represents the Greek words which underlie the Syriac and Armenian Versions.

- (1) The first sentence which bears the appearance of compression is the following: ἀνώτερον πάντων τῶν παθῶν καὶ ἐλαττωμάτων, ὀργῆς τε καὶ λήθης καὶ ἀγνοίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν. This seems to bring together several more expanded phrases witnessed to by the two Versions, which however do not agree with one another sufficiently closely to allow us to make a certain reconstruction.
- (2) In the sentence, ὅπως ἴδωμεν τίνες αὐτῶν μετέχουσι τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τίνες τῆς πλάνης, a word, corresponding to 'praefatas' (Arm.) and 'which we have spoken concerning Him' (Syr.), has dropped out before ἀληθείας: and instead of τῆς πλάνης there must have been a verb in the original; 'ab eis erraverint' (Arm.), 'have erred therefrom' (Syr.). The difference is of course exceedingly slight in itself: but it is important from a critical point of view, when we are testing the faithfulness with which the author of 'Barlaam and Josaphat' has preserved to us the original Apology. We may probably trace in this sentence the influence of an almost identical one, which comes later on, after the preliminary descriptions of the four races have been given. As the Greek combines these descriptions with the fuller

accounts afterwards given, it brings the parallel sentences close together.

- (3) The division of mankind into three races, and not four, has been already noticed¹.
- (4) It is just at this point that the most serious divergence is found: viz., the omission of the preliminary descriptions of the races, as noted above. This was perhaps the result of the change in the method of their division, which rendered unsuitable the sentences which immediately followed.

Once more, we have to ask how much is there which can be shewn, by the united testimony of the Versions, to have stood in the original Greek, and which yet finds no place in the Greek which has survived.

- (1) In the first line both Versions have 'into this world,' while the Greek has εἰς τὸν κόσμον: but the demonstrative may perhaps only be an attempt to represent the Greek article. The first real gap is eight lines lower down, where the Versions are very divergent², but yet point to some common original. It is probable that the Greek text at this point was difficult or corrupt, and so was omitted altogether by the author of 'Barlaam and Josaphat.' The topic is the difficulty and uselessness of elaborate investigation concerning the Divine nature: and the conclusion is drawn 'that one should fear God and not grieve man' (Syr.), 'utpote unum Deum nos adorare oportet: unumquemque autem nostrum proximum suum sicut semetipsum diligere' (Arm.). To this the Greek has nothing to correspond.
- (2) For the list of properties of the Divine nature we have in the Greek merely the compressed sentence, part of which was quoted above. The Versions agree in telling us more fully that 'God is not begotten, not made'; 'without beginning, because that which has a beginning has also an end'; 'without name, because that which has a name belongs to the created'; 'without likeness (Arm. 'colores,' implying $\chi\rho\hat{\omega}\mu a$ in the Greek) and composition of members (Arm. 'forma'), for he who possesses this is associated with things created' (Arm. 'mensurabilis est, limiti-

¹ See above, p. 70; and further remarks on p. 90.

² The Syriac is untranslateable as it stands,

busque cogitur'); 'neither male nor female' (Arm. adds 'quia cupiditatibus agitatur qui huic est distinctioni obnoxius'); 'the heavens do not contain Him: but the heavens and all things visible and invisible are contained in Him'; 'He has no adversary' (in the reason for this there is fresh discrepancy); 'He is altogether wisdom and understanding.' After this the Greek, as we have it, is again, for the next seven lines, obviously the same as that which lay before the translators.

- (3) Now comes the new division of mankind, and the Greek has omitted the following: 'Now the Barbarians reckon—and from Dionysus,' about six lines.
- (4) The preliminary accounts of the Jews and the Christians are found in the Greek later on, where they are amalgamated with the fuller descriptions. The account of the Jews agrees fairly well with that given in the Versions, especially in the Armenian. The additions in the Greek will be noticed presently. It adds at the close: $\kappa a\theta \acute{a}\pi \epsilon \rho$ $\epsilon \acute{l}s$ $\epsilon \acute{l}s$
- (5) The Christological passage which follows is so important that it will be an advantage to have the three forms side by side.

Οὶ δὲ χριστιανοὶ γενεαλογοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ
κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
οῦτος δὲ ὁ υἰὸς τοῦ θεοῦ
τοῦ ὑψίστου ὁμολογεῖται ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίφ
ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς διὰ
τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων
καὶ ἐκ παρθένου ἀγίας
γεννηθεὶς, ἀσπόρως τε καὶ ἀφθόρως, σάρκα ἀνέλαβε,
καὶ ἀν εφάνη ἀνθρώποις.

The Christians then reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, Who is named the Son of God most High; and it is said that God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh; and there dwelt in a daughter of man the Son of God.

Christianorum tandem genus a Domino Jesu Christo oritur. Ipse Dei altissimi est Filius, et una cum Spiritu Sancto reuelatus est nobis: de coelis descendit, ex Hebraea uirgine natus, ex uirgine carnem assumpsit, assumptaque humana natura semetipsum Dei Filium reuelauit.

Here I have distinguished by spaced type or by italics every word, which having a double testimony may be referred to the original Greek. As regards omissions, the Greek omits only the epithet 'Hebrew', which it replaces by the epithet ἀγία, and the second reference to 'the Son of God,' where however there is a discrepancy between the two Versions. The Syriac omits κυρίου,

πνεύματι άγίω, γεννηθείς, ἀνεφάνη. The Armenian has no omission that can be certainly traced. The additions in each case may be seen at a glance. The Armenian has practically none; though a few lines further down the epithet corresponding to $\theta \epsilon o \tau \acute{o} \kappa o \varsigma$ is applied to the Virgin. The most serious change is that in the Syriac, where the word 'God' is inserted as the subject of the verbs which follow. The passage is one which was more likely than any other in the whole piece to tempt later writers to make changes of their own. It is to be noted that here the Greek in spite of its additions represents the original Apology much more faithfully than the Syriac does.

- (6) In the words which follow next the Versions do not agree either with one another, or with the Greek, which has displaced the sentence and gives it a little lower down. But both the Greek and the Syriac appeal to a written Gospel, which the king might read if he chose.
- (7) The repetition of the fourfold division of mankind is of course not found in the Greek, and with it has disappeared the problematical sentence: 'To God then ministers wind, and to angels fire; but to demons water, and to men earth.' At this point the Armenian fragment ends.

What then is the result of our investigation of this opening passage, in which alone we have a triple testimony to the contents of the original Apology?

- (1) There is one serious modification (if, indeed, we have not here the original) in the Greek, as it is preserved to us; but it was necessitated by the conditions of its reproduction in its new surroundings.
- (2) There is one serious displacement in the Greek; but this was almost necessitated by the modification just mentioned.
- (3) The description of the Divine nature is very much abbreviated in the Greek; but no word occurs in it which has not the support of the Versions.
- (4) In the Christological passage which we examined in detail the Greek was seen to preserve the original statements, though with the addition of the later phrase $\partial \sigma \pi \delta \rho \omega_S \tau \epsilon \kappa a \partial \partial \phi \theta \delta \rho \omega_S$.

(5) The Syriac Version is often loose and inaccurate: it drops a phrase here and there; and it makes insertions by way of explanation or of supplement, and sometimes in such a way as to convey a wholly false conception of the original.

We learn then to expect for the remainder of the Apology that the Greek, as we have it, will as a rule give us the actual words of Aristides, except in the very few places in which modification was obviously needed. Where the Syriac presents us with matter which has no counterpart whatever in the Greek, we shall hesitate to pronounce that the Greek is defective, unless we are able to suggest a good reason for the omission, or to authenticate the Syriac from some external source.

The Greek Text of 'Barlaam and Josaphat.'

It is remarkable that this work, which at one time enjoyed such extraordinary popularity, should not have found its way into print in its original language before the present century. The Latin Version wrongly attributed to Georgius Trapezuntius, but really, as the MSS. of it prove, of a much earlier date, was printed, together with various works of S. John of Damascus, at Basel in 1539: but it was reserved to Boissonade to publish the Greek Text for the first time in the fourth volume of his *Anecdota*, which appeared at Paris in 1832.

Boissonade apologises for the meagreness of his apparatus criticus on the ground that an edition was expected almost immediately from Schmidt and Kopitar the librarian of the Imperial Library at Vienna. This edition, however, never appeared. Out of seventeen MSS, preserved in the Library at Paris, Boissonade used throughout but two, 903 and 1128, which he refers to as A and C. He gives occasional readings from two others, 904 and 907, which he names B and D. In the portion of the book which specially concerns us, viz. the speech of Nachor, C is defective for about 10 of Boissonade's pages, and the testimony of D is frequently

¹ Cf, infra, p. 90.

recorded. From time to time readings are also quoted from the Latin Version.

This very inadequate text has been reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, tom. 96, in the third volume of the works of S. John of Damascus: but we have gained nothing by the reproduction except new blunders.

In the Wiener Jahrbücher für Deutsche Literatur (lxxii. 274, lxxiii. 176) Schubart has given some description of the Vienna MSS., and a list of the principal variants contained in them.

Lastly, Zotenberg¹ has made a useful list of about 60 MSS., and has constructed a critical text of certain passages of special interest. Nothing however has been attempted as yet in the way of a genealogical classification of the MSS.; a work which will involve great labour, but which is essential to the production of a satisfactory edition.

In editing the Remains of the Apology of Aristides I have used three MSS., which were kindly placed at my disposal in Cambridge. I have recorded their variants with a greater completeness than is necessary for my present purpose, in order to aid a future editor of the whole treatise in assigning them without further trouble to their proper families.

- (1) I have to thank Miss Algerina Peckover of Wisbech for kindly sending to the University Library a MS. in her possession, which apparently belongs to the beginning of the eleventh century. This Codex is specially interesting for the pictures which a later hand has drawn in the margin, sometimes in ink and sometimes in colours. It is unfortunately defective at the beginning and at the end. It commences with the words τŷ προνοία τοῦ δημιουργοῦ φωτιζόμενα (Bois. p. 48), and ends with καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ τῶν ἐντολῶν σον ἠξίωσας τὸν δρόμον τέλε (Bois. p. 357). Unhappily it has been corrected very largely throughout, and it is frequently impossible to discover the original readings: those which are obviously by a later hand I have marked as W².
- (2) The authorities of Magdalen College, Oxford, with a like generosity allowed me to use their codex, Gr. 4, side by side with

¹ Notice sur le livre de B. et J., pp. 3-5.

the Wisbech MS in our Library. This bears the date 1064. It contains besides: a Life of S. Basil, a tract on Images, the Martyrdom of SS Galaction and Episteme, a tract on Penalties, and a work of Anastasius Sinaiticus. It has remained for the most part uncorrected.

(3) In the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge, there is a MS. of the 17th century, the readings of which are of sufficient interest to be recorded for the present in spite of its late date.

In my apparatus criticus these MSS, are referred to by the letters W, M and P respectively. I have now and then recorded readings from the Vienna MSS, collated by Schubart, using the signs V₂₁, V₁₀₂, &c., where the figures correspond with Schubart's numbers. Wherever I have differed from the text of Boissonade, I have recorded his readings, and sometimes I have expressly mentioned his MSS, A, C and D. I have given in the margin of the Greek text the reference to Boissonade's pages. Where it seemed desirable I have recorded readings of the Latin Version, taking them from the Basel edition of 1539 mentioned above.

The Bearing of the Apology on the Canon.

There are but few references to the Books of Scripture in the Apology of Aristides, which thus stands in striking contrast with the works of Justin. On two occasions the Emperor is referred to Christian writings. In the first case a written Gospel is distinctly implied, as the matter in hand is the outline of our Lord's Life; the words in the Greek are¹: οὖ τὸ κλέος τῆς παρουσίας ἐκ τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς καλουμένης εὐαγγελικῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς ἔξεστί σοι γνῶναι, βασιλεῦ, ἐὰν ἐντύχης (p. 110, l. 21). The second reference is more general, and possibly includes Books outside the Canon: ταῖς γραφαῖς ἐγκύψας τῶν χριστιανῶν εὐρήσεις, κ.τ.λ. (p. 111, l. 24; cf. Syr. supra p. 50 fin.). There are no direct quotations from the New Testament, although the Apologist's diction is undoubtedly coloured at times by the language of the Apostolic writers.

(1) The opening sentence recalls the words of 2 Macc. vii. 28: ἀξιῶ σε, τέκνον, ἀναβλέψαντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰ

 $^{^{1}}$ For the Syriac see above, p. 36 fm. 'This is taught from that Gospel,' &c.

έν αὖτοῖς πάντα ἰδόντα, γνῶναι ὅτι ἐξ οὖκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός.

- (2) p. 100, l. 11. δι' αὐτοῦ δὲ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκεν. Cf.
 Col. i. 17, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (cf. δι' αὐτοῦ in i. 16).
- (3) p. 101, l. 6. καὶ ἤρξαντο σέβεσθαι τὴν κτίσιν παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα αὐτούς. This is clearly based on Rom. i. 25: καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῷ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα. The addition of αὐτούς is interesting. The Syriac translator renders: 'and they began to serve created things instead of the Creator of them'; he is probably led to make the change by the recollection of the Syriac Version (Pesh.) in this passage, where the word 'Creator' has the suffix of the fem. plural.
- (4) p. 104, l. 2. σοφοί λέγοντες εἶναι ἐμωράνθησαν. Cf. Rom. i. 22: φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί ἐμωράνθησαν.
- (5) p. 107, l. 12. ὅθεν λαμβάνοντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀφορμὴν ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, ἔπραττον πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν καὶ ἀσέλγειαν καὶ ἀσέβειαν. These words are a kind of echo, although in a different sense, of Rom. vii. 8: ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ άμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν.
- (6) p. 109, l. 12. νυνὶ δὲ οἱ νόμοι καλοί εἰσι καὶ δίκαιοι. Here again we seem to feel the influence of the same chapter; Rom. vii. 12, 16, ὅστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἄγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή...σύνφημι τῷ νόμῷ ὅτι καλός (cf. 1 Tim. i. 8).
- (7) p. 109, l. 26. οὖτοι γὰρ, τοῦ ʿΑβραὰμ ὄντες ἀπόγονοι καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, παρώκησαν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾳ καὶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ. The first part of this sentence has affinities with Heb. xi. 8, 9, πίστει ᾿Αβραὰμ...παρώκησεν εἰς γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας...μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ. And the whole may be compared with Acts xiii. 17, ἐν τῆ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς. The second part of the phrase however is not attested by the Syr. and Arm. Versions, and may possibly have been introduced by the author of 'Barlaam and Josaphat' from Ps. exxxvi. 11, 12.
- (8) p. 110, l. 2. τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ δικαίους ἀπέκτειναν. This is a combination of words found in S. Matt. xiii. 17, πολλοὶ προφήται καὶ δίκαιοι, and S. Matt. xxiii.

- 37 (cf. S. Luke xiii. 34) η ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν. But here again we cannot be sure that we have the words of Aristides himself. This last remark applies also to the phrase, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν (p. 110, l. 9), which comes from Rom. x. 2.
- (9) p. 110, l. 19. θανάτου ἐγεύσατο clearly comes from Heb. ii. 9; but the Syr. simply has 'He died,' and the Arm. has nothing at all to correspond. Hence we cannot be certain that these are the words of Aristides. They probably have replaced the statement preserved in the Syr. 'He was pierced by the Jews.' Throughout this great Christological passage it is worth noting how the actual phrases of the N. T. are not introduced.
- (10) p. 111, l. 30. οὐ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ῥήματα λαλοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. With this we may perhaps compare 1 Thess. ii. 13, ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ, καθώς ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν, λόγον θεοῦ¹.

The Apology and the Didaché.

A source from which our author has drawn part of his description of the life and conduct of the Christians is the Two Ways, though it may well be doubted whether he knew it in the form preserved to us in the Didaché.

The passage in question runs as follows in the Apology (c. xv.): Οὐ μοιχεύουσιν, οὐ πορνεύουσιν, οὐ ψευδομαρτυροῦσιν, οὐκ ἐπιθυμοῦσι τὰ ἀλλότρια· τιμῶσι πατέρα καὶ μητέρα καὶ τοὺς

¹ The following parallels may also be noted: p. 111, l. 17, l Thess. ii. 10; p. 111, l. 29, Apoc. xv. 3; p. 108, l. 2 (ἀσυνέτων), and p. 110, l. 1 (ἀχάριστοι), Rom. i. 21; p. 109, l. 30, Rom. ix. 22; p. 111, l. 26 (οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ λέγω), Joh. vii. 17, xii. 49. Moreover there seems to be some relation between our Apology and several chapters of the Book of Wisdom, beginning with the personal statement of c. vii. 1: εἰμὶ μὲν κάγὼ θνητὸς ἄνθρωπος κ.τ.λ. Comp. esp. vii. 15 ἐμοὶ δὲ δώη ὁ θεὸς εἰπεῖν κατὰ γνώμην...αὐτὸς γάρ μοι ἔδωκε τῶν ὅντων γνῶσιν ἀψευδῆ, εἰδέναι σύστασιν κόσμου καὶ ἐνέργειαν στοιχείων κ.τ.λ....(ix. 1) ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγω σου κ.τ.λ....(xii. 24) τῶν πλάνης ὁδῶν μακρότερον ἐπλανήθησαν, θεοὺς ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὰ καὶ ἐν ζώοις κ.τ.λ.... (xiii. 2) ἀλλ' ἢ πῦρ ἢ πνεῦμα ἢ ταχινὸν ἀέρα ἢ κύκλον ἄστρων ἢ βίαιον ὕδωρ ἢ φωστῆρας οὐρανοῦ πρυτάνεις κόσμου θεοὺς ἐνόμισαν...ὁ κατασκευάσας αὐτὰ δυνατώτερὸς ἐστιν... ταλαίπωροι δὲ καὶ ἐν νεκροῖς αὶ ἐλπίδες αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ....ἐν τοίχω ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ ἀσφαλισάμενος σιδήρω...ὅτι ἀδυνατεῖ ἑαυτῷ βοηθῆσαι κ.τ.λ.

πλησίον φιλοῦσι δίκαια κρίνουσιν ὅσα οὐ θέλουσιν αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἐτέρφ οὐ ποιοῦσι τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας αὐτοὺς παρακαλοῦσι καὶ προσφιλεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐαυτοῖς ποιοῦσι τοὺς ἐχθροὺς εὐεργετεῖν σπουδάζουσι πραεῖς εἰσὶ καὶ ἐπιεικεῖς ἀπὸ πάσης συνουσίας ἀνόμου καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας ἐγκρατεύονται χήραν οὐχ ὑπερορῶσιν, ὀρφανὸν οὐ λυποῦσιν ὁ ἔχων τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι ἀνεπιφθόνως ἐπιχορηγεῖ ξένον ἐὰν ἴδωσιν, ὑπὸ στέγην εἰσάγουσι, καὶ χαίρουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, ὡς ἐπὶ ἀδελφῷ ἀληθινῷ οὐ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.

The following parallels may be adduced from the Didaché:

- c. ii. οὐ μοιχεύσεις...οὐ πορνεύσεις... οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὰ τοῦ πλησίον...οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις.
 - c. i. ἀγαπήσεις...τον πλησίον σου.
 - c. iv. κρινείς δικαίως.
- c. i. πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσης μὴ γίνεσθαί σοι, καὶ σὺ ἄλλφ μὴ ποίει.
 - c. iv. εἰρηνεύσεις δὲ μαχομένους.
 - c. iii. ἴσθι δὲ πραΰς.

To these we may perhaps add, as parallel to the last of the sentences cited above:

e. iv. οὐκ ἀποστραφήση τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου.

It may also be noted that the whole passage is prefaced by the words: ἔχουσι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ... καὶ ταύτας φυλάττουσι. Compare Did. c. iv.: οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης ἐντολὰς κυρίου, φυλάξεις δὲ κ.τ.λ.

When we turn to the Epistle of Barnabas we find there the same parallels which have been quoted from the Didaché, with two exceptions; viz., οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, and the negative form of the Golden Rule.

On the other hand, we find in Barn. c. xix.: $\hat{\eta}$ οὖν ὁδὸς τοῦ ϕ ωτός ἐστιν αὕτη ἐάν τις θέλων ὁδὸν ὁδεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν ὡρισμένον τόπον, κ.τ.λ.: with which we may compare Apol. c. xvi.: ὄντως οὖν αὕτη ἐστὶν $\hat{\eta}$ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, ἥτις τοὺς ὁδεύοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν aἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν. And the two phrases about the widow and the orphan, which found no parallel in the Didaché, may be compared with Barn. c. xx.: χήρα καὶ ὀρφανῷ οὐ προσέχοντες. Compare also Barn. c. xix.: διὰ λόγον κοπιῶν καὶ πορευόμενος εἰς

τὸ παρακαλέσαι with Apol. c. xv. (quoted above) τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας αὐτοὺς παρακαλοῦσι.

It is possible then that here we have a witness to the earlier Two Ways, which has been variously embodied in the Didaché and the Epistle of Barnabas.

Some support may be given to this view when we observe that the wording of the negative form of the Golden Rule in our Apology has a greater affinity to the famous interpolations in Codex Bezae than to the clause in the Didaché. This appears partly from the position of the first negative, and partly from the use of $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma$ rather than $\tilde{a}\lambda\lambda\sigma$.

Let us bring the various texts together:

Acts xv. 20. ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γείνεσθαι, ἐτέροις μὴ ποιεῖτε. Acts xv. 29. ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γείνεσθαι, ἐτέρω μὴ ποιεῖν.

Apol. c. xv. όσα οὐ θέλουσιν αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι, έτέρω οὐ ποιοῦσιν.

Did. c. i. πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσης μὴ γίνεσθαί σοι, καὶ σὰ ἄλλφ μὴ ποίει.

It is hardly possible therefore to believe that Aristides can have drawn this precept directly from the Didaché in the form in which we know it.

The Apology and the Preaching of Peter.

At the close of the Apology Aristides challenges the Emperor to examine the writings of the Christians, from which he declares that the materials for his defence are drawn: p. 111, l. 23: καὶ ἵνα γνῷς, βασιλεῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ταῦτα λέγω, ταῖς γραφαῖς ἐγκύψας τῶν χριστιανῶν εὐρήσεις οὐδὲν ἔξω τῆς ἀληθείας με λέγειν: or, as it is more fully said in the Syriac Version: 'Take now their writings and read in them, and lo! ye will find that not of myself have I brought these things forward nor as their advocate have I said them, but as I have read in their writings, these things I firmly believe,' &c.

We have seen already that he refers to a written Gospel for his statements as to the life and work of our Lord. We have also seen that he has drawn part of his description of the conduct of the Christians from the 'Two Ways.' Moreover the Book of Wisdom seems to have influenced his method and his language in several parts of his work.

The following investigation will tend to shew that he owes a still greater debt to a work now lost, which exercised a considerable influence upon the writings of the second century.

The Preaching of Peter (κήρυγμα Πέτρου) is classed by Eusebius (H. E. III. 3) together with his Acts, his Gospel and his Apocalypse as outside the Canon of writings accepted by the universal Church (οὐδ' ὅλως ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα). He goes on to say of these four books that none of the early writers or of his contemporaries used quotations from them. This statement is however incorrect: for Clement of Alexandria again and again quotes from both the Preaching and the Apocalypse, as authoritative works. The Preaching of Peter then was one of those books which, like the Didaché, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, at one time claimed a place in the Canon; though its claim was disallowed, even more emphatically perhaps than the claims of these other competitors.

We must in the first instance gather together all the fragments which can be assigned with certainty to this work. For the sake of clearness I have arranged them in the order in which it will be most easy to compare them with our Apology.

Clem. Al. Strom. VI. 39 ff. Γινώσκετε οὖν ὅτι εἶς θεός ἐστιν, ὃς ἀρχὴν πάντων ἐποίησεν καὶ τέλους ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ ὁ ἀόρατος ὃς τὰ πάντα ὁρᾳ, ἀχώρητος ὃς τὰ πάντα χωρεῖ, ἀνεπιδεὴς οὖ τὰ πάντα ἐπιδέεται καὶ δι' ὃν ἔστιν²· ἀκατάληπτος, ἀέναος, ἄφθαρτος, ἀποίητος, ὡς τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν λόγω δυναμέως αὐτοῦ³.

Τοῦτον τὸν θεὸν σέβεσθε μὴ κατὰ τοὺς "Ελληνας 4. ὅτι ἀγνοία

- ¹ Hilgenfeld (N. T. extra Can. pp. 56 ff.), to whose work I need scarcely acknowledge my indebtedness, has brought together under the head of Πέτρου (καὶ ΙΙαύλου) κήρυγμα, various fragments of the Didascalia Petri, &c. The fact that these find no parallels in Aristides will give a new reason for keeping them separate.
- ² Apol. c. i. αὐτὸν οὖν λέγω εἶναι θεὸν τὸν συστησάμενον τὰ πάντα καὶ διακρατοῦντα ...ἀπροσδεῆ...πάντες δὲ αὐτοῦ χρήζουσιν.
- ³ c. i. 'Now I say that God is not begotten, not made: a constant nature,... immortal, complete, and incomprehensible...the heavens do not contain Him; but the heavens and all things visible and invisible are contained in Him' (Syr.).
 - c. iv. ἄφθαρτος...καὶ ἀόρατος, αὐτὸς δὲ πάντα ὁρᾶ.
 - α. Χίν. τὸν ἀόρατον καὶ πάντα ὁρῶντα καὶ πάντα δημιουργήσαντα δεῖ θεὸν σέβεσθαι.
 - 4 cc. viii. ff.

φερόμενοι καὶ μὴ ἐπιστάμενοι τὸν θεὸν¹ (ὡς ἡμεῖς κατὰ τὴν γνῶσιν τὴν τελείαν), ὧν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίας εἰς χρῆσιν² μορφώσαντες³ ξύλα καὶ λίθους, χαλκὸν καὶ σίδηρον, χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον, τῆς ὕλης αὐτῶν καὶ χρήσεως τὰ δοῦλα τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἀναστήσαντες σέβονται καὶ ὰ δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς εἰς βρῶσιν ὁ θεὸς, πετεινὰ τοῦ ἀέρος καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τὰ νηκτὰ καὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ ἐρπετὰ καὶ τὰ θηρία σὺν κτήνεσι τετραπόδοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ, γαλᾶς τε καὶ μῦς, αἰλούρους τε καὶ κύνας καὶ πιθήκους⁴ καὶ τὰ ἴδια βρώματα βρωτοῖς⁵ θύματα θύουσιν, καὶ νεκρὰ νεκροῖς⁶ προσφέροντες ὡς θεοῖς ἀχαριστοῦσι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τούτων ἀρνούμενοι αὐτὸν εἶναι⁴.

Μηδὲ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους σέβεσθε, καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι μόνοι οἰόμενοι τὸν θεὸν γινώσκειν οὐκ ἐπίστανται, λατρεύοντες ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀρχαγγέλοις, μηνὶ καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σελήνη φανἢ, σάββατον οὐκ ἄγουσι τὸ λεγόμενον πρῶτον, οὐδὲ ἄζυμα οὐτε ἑορτὴν οὐτε μεγάλην ἡμέραν⁸.

"Ωστε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως μανθάνοντες ὰ παραδίδομεν ὑμῖν φυλάσσεσθε⁹, καινῶς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ σεβόμενοι. εὕρομεν γὰρ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, καθως ὁ κύριος λέγει· Ἰδοὺ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καινὴν διαθήκην, οὐχ ὡς διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν ἐν ὄρει Χωρήβ. νέαν ὑμῖν διέθετο· τὰ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ἰουδαίων παλαιὰ, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ καινῶς αὐτὸν τρίτω γένει σεβόμενοι Χριστιανοί¹⁰.

- 1 c. iii. μη είδότες θεον έπλανήθησαν.
- 2 c. v. καὶ αὐτὸ γὰρ εἰς χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων γέγονε, καὶ κατακυριεύεται ὑπ' αὐτῶν (et saepius).
- 3 c. iii. ὧν καὶ μορφώματά τινα ποιήσαντες ὼνόμασαν ἐκτύπωμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, κ.τ.λ.... καὶ συγκλείσαντες ναοῖς προσκυνοῦσι.
- 4 c. xii. τινès γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐσεβάσθησαν πρόβατον...τινès δὲ τὸν αἴλουρον καὶ τὸν κύνα καὶ τὸν λύκον καὶ τὸν πίθηκον, κ.τ.λ.
- 5 c. xii. ἄλογα ζῶα παρεισήγαγον θεοὐς εἶναι, χερσαῖά τε καὶ ἔνυδρα...ὀρῶντες γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν βιβρωσκομένους ὑπὸ ἐτέρων ἀνθρώπων...(this confirms Potter's emendation βρωτοῖς for βροτοῖς.) 6 c. iii. σ εβόμενοι ἀγάλματα νεκρά.
 - 7 c. xiv. ἀγνώμονες καὶ αὐτοὶ φανέντες καὶ ἀχάριστοι...ἀρνοῦνται τὸν υίὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.
- 8 c. xiv. 'The Jews...suppose in their minds that they are serving God, but... their service is to angels and not to God, in that they observe sabbaths and new moons and the passover and the great fast and the fast, and circumcision, and cleanness of meats.' (Syr.)
 - ⁹ c. xv. τὰ γὰρ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ ἀσφαλῶς φυλάττουσιν, όσίως καὶ δικαίως ζώντες.
 - 10 c. xvi. 'And this people is truly a new people,' &c. (Syr.)
- c. ii. φανερὸν...ὅτι τρία γένη εἰδὶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῷδε τῷ κόσμῳ ˙ ὧν εἰσὶν οἱ τῶν παρ' ὑμῦν λεγομένων θεῶν προσκυνηταὶ, καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ χριστιανοί. 'There are four races of men in this world: Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians.' (Syr.)

- Ιbid. 48. (ὁ κύριός φησι πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν) Ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς δώδεκα μαθητὰς, κρίνας ἀξίους ἐμοῦ (οὺς ὁ κύριος ἢθέλησεν καὶ ἀποστόλους πιστοὺς ἡγησάμενος εἶναι), πέμπων ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον εὐαγγελίσασθαι τοὺς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀνθρώπους¹, γινώσκειν ὅτι εἶς θεός ἐστιν, διὰ τῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ πίστεως ἐμῆς δηλοῦντας τὰ μέλλοντα, ὅπως οἱ ἀκούσαντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες σωθώσιν, οἱ δὲ μὴ πιστεύσαντες ἀκούσαντες μαρτυρήσωσιν, οἰκ ἔχοντες ἀπολογίαν εἰπεῖν Οὐκ ἢκούσαμεν. (τί οὖν; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐν Αἴδου ἡ αὐτὴ γέγονεν οἰκονομία;)²
- Ibid. 43. ἐὰν μὲν οὖν τις θελήση τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μετανοήσας διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν, ἀφεθήσονται αὐτῷ αἱ ἀμαρτίαι. μετὰ δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον, μή τις εἴπη Οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν.
- Ibid. 48. ὅσα ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ τις ὑμῶν ἐποίησεν μὴ εἰδῶς σαφῶς τὸν θεὸν, ἐὰν ἐπιγνοὺς μετανοήση, πάντα αὐτῷ ἀφεθήσεται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα³.
- Ibid. 128. ήμεῖς δὲ ἀναπτύξαντες τὰς βίβλους ἃς εἴχομεν τῶν προφητῶν, ἃ μὲν διὰ παραβολῶν, ἃ δὲ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἃ δὲ αὐθεντικῶς καὶ αὐτολεξεὶ τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ὀνομαζόντων, εὕρομεν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς κολάσεις πάσας ὅσας ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι⁴, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν πρὸ τοῦ Ἰεροσόλυμα κτισθῆναι, καθῶς ἐγέγραπτο. ταῦτα πάντα ἃ ἔδει αὐτὸν παθεῖν, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἃ ἔσται. ταῦτα οὖν ἐπιγνόντες ἐπιστεύσαμεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῶν γεγραμμένων εἰς αὐτόν⁵.

ἔγνωμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὰ προσέταξεν ὄντως 6, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄτερ γραφῆς λέγομεν 7.

- 1 c. xv. οῦτος δώδεκα ἔσχε μαθητάς, οἱ μετὰ τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἄνοδον αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὰς ἐπαρχίας τῆς οἰκουμένης καὶ ἐδίδαξαν κ.τ.λ.
- ² c. ii. 'He had twelve disciples, in order that a certain dispensation of His might be fulfilled' (Syr.); c. xv. κατ' οἰκονομίαν μεγάλην.
- ³ c. xvi. 'And when it chances that one of them turns...he confesses to God, saying, In ignorance I did these things: and he cleanses his heart, and his sins are forgiven him, because he did them in ignorance in former time' (Syr.).
 - 4 c. ii. 'He was pierced by the Jews' (Syr.).
- ⁵ c. xvi. 'As I have read in their writings, these things I firmly believe, and those things also that are to come' (Syr.).
 - 6 c. xv. καθώς κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς προσέταξεν...ὄντως οὖν αὕτη κ.τ.λ. (c. xvi).
- 7 c. xvi. καὶ ἴνα γνώς, βασιλεῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ταῦτα λέγω, ταῖς γραφαῖς ἐγκύψας τῶν χριστιανῶν, εὐρήσεις οὐδὲν ἔξω τῆς ἀληθείας με λέγειν.

I have given above in full (with one exception; Clem. Strom. i. 182, $\nu \delta \mu \sigma s \kappa a \lambda \delta \gamma \sigma s \delta \kappa \nu \rho \iota \sigma s$) all the indisputable fragments of the Preaching of Peter¹: and the parallels adduced from the Apology of Aristides shew that there is an intimate connexion between the two documents.

Before going further into the interesting problem of the reconstruction of the Preaching, let us inquire what light these parallels throw upon the relation of the Syriac Version to the Greek text of the Apology.

(1) Several passages of the Syriac Version, quoted above in the notes, which are wanting in the Greek as we now have it, are authenticated by their similarity to portions of the Preaching.

Of these the most important are: (a) the worship of angels attributed to the Jews; (b) the description of the Christians as a 'new people'; (c) the confession of the converted heathen; (d) the attribution of our Lord's sufferings to the Jews. Especially valuable are (a) and (c), as giving us ground for believing that the great closing section of the Syriac Version, which is so curtailed in the Greek, is substantially the writing of Aristides himself.

(2) On the other hand, the division into three races, which we find in the Greek, has the support of the famous τρίτφ γένει of the Preaching. The fourfold division of the Syriac and Armenian Versions (Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians) comes therefore under grave suspicion: and the more we examine it, the less primitive it appears. For to the Greek mind the Jews were themselves Barbarians: see, for example, Clem. Strom. vi. 44, νόμος μὲν καὶ προφῆται βαρβάροις, φιλοσοφία δὲ "Ελλησι: and Orig. c. Cels. i. 2, ἐξῆς βάρβαρόν φησιν ἄνωθεν εἶναι τὸ δόγμα, δηλονότι τὸν Ἰονδαϊσμόν. Moreover there seems to be no parallel to this fourfold classification of races in early Christian literature.

The Preaching of Peter is quoted by Heracleon (Orig. Comm. in Joan, xiii. 17), and we shall see that possibly it was used by

¹ The context of the quotations in Clement may sometimes give us, in the light thrown by the Apology, further materials for the reconstruction of the Preaching. Thus Strom. vi. 127, ὅταν τις τὸν νίὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποιηκότος σάρκα ἀνειληφότα καὶ ἐν μήτρα παρθένου κυοφορηθέντα, καθὸ γεγέννηται τὸ αἰσθητὸν αὐτοῦ σαρκίον, ἀκολούθως δὲ καθὸ γέγονεν τοῦτο πεπονθότα καὶ ἀνιστάμενον ὁ μὲν λέγει, οἱ δὲ ἀκούουσιν, κ.τ.λ., has several points of resemblance with Apol. c. xv., οἰτος δὲ ὁ νίὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου ὁμολογεῖται...ἐκ παρθένου ἀγιας γεννηθείς...σάρκα ἀνέλαβε, κ.τ.λ.

Celsus. It seems also to have been in the hands of the unknown writer of the Epistle to Diognetus. Moreover in the Sibylline Oracles we have several passages which seem to be based on it. Some of these are especially interesting, as shewing coincidences with our Apology, though not with the existing fragments of the Preaching¹.

Now if three or four extant works can be shewn to have drawn materials from a document, which is known to us now only by a few fragments, there is obviously a possibility that the lost document may be to some extent critically reconstructed by a consideration of common matter found in any two of the works, which may accordingly have been taken from the document in question. To attempt to do this fully for the Preaching of Peter would be beyond our present scope: but we may fairly consider here what contributions to such a reconstruction are afforded by our Apology, which has apparently made so free a use of it.

Let us begin with those passages which either the Preaching or the Apology have in common with the Sibylline Oracles. I shall not attempt a discrimination between the various writings which are gathered under the name of the Sibyl, but shall simply give references to Alexandre's edition of 1869.

Prooem. 7 ff.

Είς θεός, ὃς μόνος ἄρχει, ὑπερμεγέθης, ἀγένητος, παντοκράτωρ, ἀόρατος, ὁρῶν μόνος αὐτὸς ἄπαντα, αὐτὸς δ' οὐ βλέπεται θνητῆς ὑπὸ σαρκὸς ἁπάσης.

<mark>αὐτὸν τὸν μόνον ὄντα σέβεσθ' ἡγήτορα κόσμου,</mark> ὃς μόνος εἰς αἰῶνα καὶ ἐξ αἰῶνος ἐτύχθη, αὐτογενὴς, ἀγένητος, ἄπαντα κρατῶν διαπαντός.

1 The Gnostic Acts of Thomas are frequently indebted to the Preaching of Peter, as may be seen by the following passages: c. 1, διείλαμεν τὰ κλίματα τῆς οἰκουμένης κ.τ.λ.: c. 15, καὶ εἰπεῖν μὲν ὡς δεῖ οὐ δύναμαι, ἃ δὲ χωρῶ λέγειν περὶ αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.: c. 28, οὐκ ἔχει τις λόγον ἀπολογίας μέλλων παρ' αὐτοῦ κρίνεσθαι, ὡς μὴ ἀκούσας: c. 36, οὐδὲ θυσιῶν δέεται ἴνα αὐτῷ θύσης: c. 38, ἀλλὰ παραβλέπει ὑμῶν τὰ παραπτώματα ἃ κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἦτε πεποιηκότες: c. 55, τῶν πράξεων ὧν διεπράξασθε χωρὶς γνώσεως...πιστεύσατε...καὶ ἀφίησιν ὑμῖν τὰ πρὸ τού του πεπραγμένα ἀμαρτήματα: c. 56, μὴ λογίση ἡμῶν τὰ παραπτώματα καὶ τὰ πρῶτα σφάλματα, ἃ διεπραξάμεθα ἐν ἀγνοία ὄντες (see too the argument from prophecy in the same chapter).

άλλὰ θεὸς μόνος εἶς πανυπέρτατος, δς πεποίηκεν οὐρανὸν, ἦέλιον τε καὶ ἀστέρας, ἦδὲ σελήνην, καρποφόρον γαῖάν τε καὶ ὕδατος οἴδματα πόντου.

ήμιν τε κτήνη ύπέταξεν πάντα βροτοίσιν, πάντων θ' ήγητήρα κατέστησεν θεότευκτον, ἀνδρὶ δ' ύπέταξεν, κ.τ.λ.

αἰσχύνθητε γαλᾶς καὶ κνώδαλα θειοποιοῦντες. οὐ μανίη καὶ λύσσα φρενῶν [αἴσθησιν ἀφαιρεῖ], εἰ λοπάδας κλέπτουσι θεοὶ, συλοῦσι δὲ χύτρας;

προσκυνέοντες ὄφεις, κύνας, αἰλούρους, ἀνόητοι, καὶ πετεηνὰ σέβεσθε, καὶ ἐρπετὰ θηρία γαίης, καὶ λίθινα ξόανα, καὶ ἀγάλματα χειροποίητα, κὰν παρόδοισι λίθων συγχώματα· ταῦτα σέβεσθε, ἄλλα τε πολλὰ μάταια, ἃ δή κ' αἰσχρὸν ἀγορεύειν.

Bk. iii. 9 ff.

τίπτε μάτην πλάζεσθε, καὶ οὖκ εὖθεῖαν ἀταρπὸν βαίνετε, ἀθανάτου κτίστου μεμνημένος αἰεί; εἶς θεός ἐστι μόναρχος, ἀθέσφατος, αἰθέρι ναίων, αὖτοφυὴς, ἀόρατος, ὁρῶν μόνος αὐτὸς ἄπαντα. ὃν χείρ γ' οὖκ ἐποίησε λιθοξόος, οὖδ' ἀπὸ χρυσοῦ τέχνης ἀνθρώπου φαίνει τύπος, οὖδ' ἐλέφαντος.

τίς γὰρ θυητὸς ἐων κατιδεῖν δύναται θεὸν ὅσσοις; ἢ τίς χωρήσει κἂν τοὔνομα μοῦνον ἀκοῦσαι οὐρανίου μεγάλοιο θεοῦ, κόσμον κρατέοντος; ὃς λόγω ἔκτισε πάντα, καὶ οὐρανὸν ἦδὲ θάλασσαν, ἦέλιόν τ' ἀκάμαντα, σελήνην τε πλήθουσαν, ἄστρα τε, κ.τ.λ.

οὐ σέβετ', οὐδὲ φοβεῖσθε θεὸν, ματαίως δὲ πλανᾶσθε προσκυνέοντες ὄφεις τε, καὶ αἰλούροισι θύοντες, εἰδώλοις τ' ἄλλοις, λιθίνοις θ' ἱδρύμασι φωτῶν, καὶ ναοῖς ἀθέοισι καθεζόμενοι πρὸ θυράων, τηρεῖτε τὸν ἐόντα θεὸν, ὃς πάντα φυλάσσει.

Bk. viii. 375 ff.

ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος οἶδα, ὃς οὐρανὸν ἔκτισα καὶ γῆν, μοῦνος γὰρ θεός εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς ἄλλος. εἰκόνα θεσπίζουσιν ἐμὴν, ληφθεῖσαν ἀφ' ὕλης, χειρί τε μορφώσαντες ἐπ' εἰδώλοισιν ἀναύδοις δοξάζουσι λιταῖς καὶ θρησκείαισιν ἀνάγνοις. τὸν κτίστην προλιπόντες ἀσελγείαις ἐλάτρευσαν.

οὐ χρήζω θυσιῶν, οὐ σπονδῶν ὑμετεράων.

ταῦτα γὰρ, εἰς μνήμην βασιλήων ήδὲ τυράννων, δαίμοσι ποιήσουσι νεκροῖς, ὡς οὐρανίοισι.

When with these passages before us we read over again the early sections of the Preaching and the parallels to them which I have quoted from Aristides, we shall feel that we have here something more than ordinary commonplaces about the unity of God and the folly of idolatry. Again, when we compare together the first and second groups of passages from the Sibylline Books, we shall be led to ask for a common basis which shall explain their resemblances. Neither seems to be a direct imitation of the other: each presents us with words and phrases not found in the other, but accounted for at once on the supposition that either the Preaching of Peter or our own Apology lies in the background. Thus in the first we have $\pi a \nu \tau o \kappa \rho \acute{a} \tau \omega \rho , \dot{a} \gamma \acute{e} \nu \eta \tau \sigma s$, $\gamma a \lambda \hat{a} s$, $\pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \eta \nu \dot{a} \kappa a \dot{e} \rho \pi \epsilon \tau \dot{a}$, $\dot{a} \delta \dot{\eta} \kappa \dot{a} a \dot{e} \sigma \rho \epsilon \dot{\nu} \epsilon \nu \nu$. In the second, $\tau o \ddot{v} \nu o \mu a$, $\lambda \acute{o} \gamma \omega \ddot{e} \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \epsilon$, $\nu a o \hat{s} s \ldots \tau \eta \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota} \tau \epsilon$.

Moreover the mention of Creation by the Word guides us to the Preaching, in preference to the Apology, in which this finds no place: and the phrases which are found in the Apology, but not in the Preaching, need not cause us difficulty when we remember how very fragmentary is our knowledge of the latter document.

In fact we may at once begin a tentative reconstruction, and say that the Preaching probably contained

- (1) παντοκράτωρ and ἀγένητος as epithets of the Deity;
- (2) the verb διακρατεῖν of His continuous action upon created things;
- (3) the statement that the Deity has no outward image, and no name;

- (4) that God created 'heaven, earth and sea, sun, moon and stars';
 - (5) that these were made for the sake of Man;
- (6) among objects of false worship, ὄφεις, and other things disgraceful even to name in such a connexion;
 - (7) a reference to the folly of guarding the Deity.

From the lines in the eighth Book we may add:

- (8) the desertion of the Creator for the creature;
- (9) that God has no need of sacrifice and oblation.

Another passage of the Sibylline writings bears a striking resemblance to our Apology. This is the commencement of the fourth Book', of which Alexandre says: 'Liber hic Christianorum Sibyllinorum antiquissimus est habendus, scriptus nempe primo saeculo.' It opens with lines which recall much of what has been already cited, dealing with the attributes of the Creator. It then gives a brief description of the men who shall one day inhabit the earth (ll. 25 ff.). We may select the following passages:

οσσοι δη στέρξουσι θεον μέγαν, εὐλογέοντες πριν φαγέειν πιέειν τε, πεποιθότες εὐσεβέησιν.

οὐδ' ἄρ' ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίη κοίτη πόθον αἰσχρὸν ἔχοντες, οὕτ' ἐπὶ ἄρσενος ὕβριν ἀπεχθέα τε στυγερήν τε. ὧν τρόπον εὐσεβίην τε καὶ ἤθεα ἀνέρες ἄλλοι οὔποτε μιμήσονται, ἀναιδείην ποθέοντες ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς χλεύη τε γέλωτί τε μυχθίζοντες, νήπιοι ἀφροσύνησιν, ἐπιψεύσονται ἐκείνοις, ὅσσ' αὐτοὶ ῥέξουσιν, ἐπίψογα καὶ κακὰ ἔργα.

With reference to the first of these passages, we may remember that in the description of the Christians in c. xv. we saw that Aristides uses the 'Two Ways': but at the end of his account he adds words which remind us forcibly of the Preaching of Peter: ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως ζῶντες, καθώς κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς προσέταξεν: and then he goes on: εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ κατὰ πᾶσαν ὅραν ἐν παντὶ βρώματι καὶ ποτῷ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀγαθοῖς.

 $^{^{1}}$ It is not unimportant to observe that this Book has also remarkable affinities with the Apocalypse of Peter.

With regard to the second passage, there is a still more striking parallel in c. xvii., preserved to us only in the Syriac Version. 'The Greeks then, O king, because they practise foul things in sleeping with males, and with mother and sister and daughter, turn the ridicule of their foulness upon the Christians; but the Christians are honest and pious,' etc.

These coincidences are worth noting even if we are not prepared, with our present knowledge, to suppose that they send us back for their explanation to the Preaching of Peter¹.

Next let us turn to the Epistle to Diognetus. As soon as the Armenian fragment of Aristides was discovered, it was observed that it had points in common with this anonymous Epistle. The coincidences have multiplied greatly with our larger knowledge of the Apology. Several of them have been quoted by Mr Harris in his notes, but it is necessary for our present purpose to bring them together again under one view. I shall do this in the briefest possible form, giving in the footnotes references to such parallels in the Apology as have not already been quoted above.

Ερ. ad Diog. c. 1. οὔτε τοὺς νομιζομένους ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων θεοὺς λογίζονται, οὔτε τὴν Ἰουδαίων δεισιδαιμονίαν φυλάσσουσι ...καὶ τί δήποτε καινὸν τοῦτο γένος ἢ ἐπιτήδευμα εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν βίον νῦν καὶ οὖ πρότερον.

παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ καὶ τὸ λέγειν καὶ τὸ ἀκούειν ἡμῖν χορηγοῦντος, αἰτοῦμαι δοθῆναι ἐμοὶ μὲν εἰπεῖν οὕτως² κ.τ.λ.

c. 2. ώς ầν καὶ λόγου καινοῦ...ἀκροατής ἐσόμενος.

οὐχ ὁ μέν τις λίθος ἐστὶν ὅμοιος τῷ πατουμένῳ, ὁ δ' ἐστὶ χαλκὸς οὐ κρείσσων τῶν εἰς τὴν χρῆσιν ἡμῖν κεχαλκευμένων σκευῶν, ὁ δὲ ξύλον ἤδη καὶ σεσηπός, ὁ δὲ ἄργυρος χρήζων ἀνθρώπου τοῦ φυλάξαντος ἵνα μὴ κλαπῆ, ὁ δὲ σίδηρος κ.τ.λ.

είς την μορφην τούτων έκτυπωθηναι κ.τ.λ.

 $^{^2}$ Ap.~e.~ii.~ τούτων οὔτως εἰρημένων περὶ θεοῦ, καθώς ἐμὲ ἐχώρησε περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν.

³ Ap. c. iii, ων καὶ μορφώματά τινα ποιήσαντες ωνόμασαν ἐκτύπωμα κ.τ.λ.

τους δε αργυρέους και χρυσούς εγκλείσαντες ταις νυξί, και ταίς ήμέραις φύλακας παρακαθιστάντες, ίνα μή κλαπώσιν1.

c. 3. έξης δè περὶ τοῦ μη κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ Ἰουδαίοις θεοσεβείν... Ιουδαίοι τοίνυν...καλώς θεόν ένα τών πάντων σέβειν, καὶ δεσπότην άξιοῦσι φρονεῖν εἰ δὲ τοῖς προειρημένοις δμοιοτρόπως² την θρησκείαν προσάγουσιν αὐτῷ ταύτην, διαμαρτάνουσιν.

ό γὰρ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν χορηγών ὧν προσδεόμεθα, οὐδενὸς αν αὐτὸς προσδέοιτο τούτων ὧν τοῖς οἰομένοις διδόναι παρέχει

αὐτός, οἱ δέ γε θυσίας κ.τ.λ.

c. 4. άλλα μην τό γε περί τὰς βρώσεις αὐτῶν ψοφοδεές, καὶ την περί τὰ σάββατα δεισιδαιμονίαν, καὶ την της περιτομής άλαζονείαν, καὶ τὴν τῆς νηστείας καὶ νουμηνίας εἰρωνείαν, $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$.

τό τε γὰρ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κτισθέντων εἰς χρῆσιν άνθρώπων, κ.τ.λ.

- τὸ δὲ παρεδρεύοντας αὐτοὺς ἄστροις καὶ σελήνη τὴν παρατήρησιν τῶν μηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν ποιεῖσθαι, κ.τ.λ.
- c. 6. χριστιανοί κατέχονται μèν ώς ἐν φρουρὰ τῷ κόσμῳ, αὐτοὶ δὲ συνέχουσι τὸν κόσμον³.
- c. 7. οὐ γὰρ ἐπίγειον, ὡς ἔφην, εὕρημα τοῦτ' αὐτοῖς παρεδόθη, οὐδὲ θνητήν ἐπίνοιαν φυλάσσειν οὕτως ἀξιοῦσιν ἐπιμελώς, οὐδὲ ανθρωπίνων οἰκονομίαν μυστηρίων πεπίστευνται. άλλ' αὐτὸς άληθως ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ παντοκτίστης καὶ ἀόρατος θεὸς, αὐτὸς...τὸν λόγον τὸν ἄγιον...ἐνίδρυσε καὶ ἐγκατεστήριξε ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν4.
- c. 8. οί μέν τινες πῦρ ἔφασαν εἶναι τὸν θεὸν (οὖ μέλλουσι χωρήσειν αὐτοὶ, τοῦτο καλοῦσι θεὸν), οἱ δὲ ὕδωρ, οἱ δ' ἄλλο τι τῶν στοιχείων τῶν ἐκτισμένων ὑπὸ θεοῦ.

² Ap. c. xiv. κ al ϵ l σ l π a ρ b μ oιοι τ $\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\hat{\epsilon}$ $\theta\nu$ $\hat{\omega}\nu$.

¹ Ap. c. iii. συγκλείσαντες ναοίς...τηρούσιν άσφαλώς ίνα μη κλαπώσιν.

³ Ap. c. xvi. 'And I have no doubt that the world stands by reason of the intercession of the Christians' (Syr.).

⁴ Ap. c. xv. οδτοί είσιν οἱ ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς εὐρόντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν: γινώσκουσι γάρ τὸν θεὸν κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ἀπάντων...ἔχουσι τὰς ἐντολὰς...ἐν ταίς καρδίαις κεχαραγμένας.

c. 10. ό γὰρ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἦγάπησε, δι' οὺς ἐποίησε τὸν κόσμον, οἶς ὑπέταξε πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ.

ος, α παρα του θεου λαβων έχει, ταυτα τοις επιδεομένοις χορηγών, θεος γίνεται των λαμβανόντων, ουτος μιμητής εστι θεου.

Here again then we are guided to the hypothesis that the Preaching lies behind both of these works. Can we gain anything further in the way of its reconstruction?

Taking up some of our former points (see p. 93) we are confirmed in thinking that the Preaching contained

- (1) παντοκράτωρ as an epithet of the Deity.
- (2) the statement that God created 'heaven and earth and all that is therein.'
- (3) that these were made for the sake of Man; and we may add 'placed in subjection under him.' (Cf. Or. Sibyl. *Procem.*, quoted above.)
 - (4) a reference to the folly of guarding the Deity.
 - (5) that God has no need of sacrifices.

We may perhaps go on to add

- (6) a statement that God must give the power to speak rightly of Him.
- (7) a reference to circumcision and meats in treating of the Jews.
 - (8) the position of the Christians as sustaining the world.
 - (9) the fixing of God's commandments in their hearts.

¹ Ap. c. i. 'He is God of all, who made all for the sake of man' (Syr.).

 2 Ap. c. xiv. 'They imitate God by reason of the love which they have for man: for they have compassion on the poor,' &c. (Syr.).

- (10) a reasoned condemnation of the worship of fire, water and other elements.
 - (11) the imitation of God consists in beneficence.

Mr Harris has collected (pp. 23 ff.) several instances of contact between the Apology of Aristides and the True Word of Celsus; and he has suggested that Celsus may have had the Apology in his hands when he wrote his attack upon Christianity. We are now in a position to see that most of the coincidences which have been pointed out would be accounted for by the supposition that it was the Preaching of Peter itself, and not our Apology, which, like 'Jason and Papiscus' and other apocryphal writings, supplied the materials of his attack.

It will be more satisfactory to present the evidence in full as we have done in the previous cases, even at the risk of some repetition. I shall follow the order of Origen's reply.

Orig. c. Cels. I. 4. κοινὸν εἶναι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους φιλοσόφους, ὡς οὐ σεμνόν τι καὶ καινὸν μάθημα. Cf. II. 5 μηδὲν δὲ καινὸν ἐν τούτοις διδάσκεσθαι φαίνων χριστιανοὺς, οἴεται ἀνατρέπειν χριστιανισμόν. Also IV. 14 λέγω δὲ οὐδὲν καινὸν, ἀλλὰ πάλαι δεδογμένα (i.e. he does not claim novelty for his view, as they do for theirs).

- Ι. 23. τῷ ἡγησαμένω σφῶν ἐπόμενοι Μωϋσῆ...ἔνα ἐνόμισαν εἶναι θεόν.
- Ι. 26. λέγων αὐτοὺς σέβειν ἀγγέλους καὶ γοητεία προσκεῖσθαι, ἦς ὁ Μωϋσῆς αὐτοῖς γέγονεν ἐξηγητής. ποῦ γὰρ τῶν γραμμάτων Μωϋσέως εὖρε τὸν νομοθέτην παραδιδόντα σέβειν ἀγγέλους...ἐπαγγέλλεται δὲ διδάξειν ἑξῆς, πῶς καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας ἐσφάλησαν ἐξαπατώμενοι¹ (cf. V. 6).
- ...περὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ήμῶν, ώς γενομένου ήγεμόνος τῆ καθὸ χριστιανοί ἐσμεν γενέσει ήμῶν· καί φησιν αὐτὸν πρὸ πάνυ ολίγων ἐτῶν τῆς διδασκαλίας ταύτης καθηγήσασθαι, νομισθέντα ὑπὸ χριστιανῶν υἱὸν εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ².
- Ι. 28. πρώτον δὲ ώς πλασαμένου αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γένεσιν.

¹ Ap. c. xiv.

 $^{^2}$ Ap. c. xv. οἱ δὲ χριστιανοὶ γενεαλογοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. οὖτος δὲ ὁ νιὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου ὁμολογεῖται...καὶ ἐκ παρθένου ἀγίας γεννηθείς.

Ι. 49 f. ἀλλ' εἶπεν ὁ ἐμὸς προφήτης ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ποτὲ, ὅτι ἥξεὶ θεοῦ υἱὸς, τῶν ὁσίων κριτὴς, καὶ τῶν ἀδίκων κολαστής... τί μᾶλλον σὰ ἢ ἄλλοι μυρίοι, οἱ μετὰ τὴν προφητείαν γενόμενοι, εἰσὶ περὶ ὧν ταῦτα προεφητεύετο;

III. 19. μηδὲν σεμνότερον τράγων καὶ κυνῶν, τῶν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις, εἰσάγοντας ἐν ταῖς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διηγήσεσιν.

III. 22. ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν λόγῳ Διοσκούρους καὶ 'Ηρακλέα καὶ 'Ασκληπιὸν καὶ Διόνυσον ὀνομάζει...καί φησιν οὐκ ἀνέχεσθαι μὲν ἡμᾶς τούτους νομίζειν θεοὺς, ὅτι ἄνθρωποι ἦσαν... τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀποθανόντα, κ.τ.λ.

IV. 23. καὶ ἡμῖν πάντα ὑποβέβληται, γῆ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀἡρ καὶ ἄστρα, καὶ ἡμῶν ἔνεκα πάντα, καὶ ἡμῖν δουλεύειν τέτακται. (Cf. IV. 99, οὔκουν ἀνθρώπω πεποίηται τὰ πάντα.)

Besides these parallels there are several instances in which Celsus seems to turn a weapon used by the Christians back upon themselves: e.g., I. 54, ὀνειδίζει τῷ σωτῆρι ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει, ὡς μὴ βοηθηθέντι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἡ μὴ δυνηθέντι ἑαντῷ βοηθῆσαι¹. II. 9, καίτοι θεὸν, φησὶν, ὄντα φεύγειν ἐνῆν, οἴτε δεθέντα ἀπάγεσθαι, κ.τ.λ. So again in III. 42, his reply to the charge of corruptibility brought against idols is that flesh is still more corruptible: παραβάλλων τὰς ἀνθρωπίνας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ σάρκας χρυσῷ καὶ ἀργύρῷ καὶ λίθῷ, ὅτι αὖται ἐκείνων φθαρτότεραι. And in III. 76 we seem to hear the echo of Christian words in: ὅμοιον ποιεῖν τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν διδάσκαλον, ὡς εἴ τις μεθύων εἰς μεθύοντας παριὼν κακηγορεῖ τοὺς νήφοντας ὡς μεθύοντας².

It is not easy on the evidence here collected to say whether it was the Preaching of Peter or the Apology of Aristides which lay before Celsus, but we can hardly doubt that it must have been one or the other. The statement that the world was made for the sake of man does not find a place in the recognised fragments of the Preaching; but we have given good reasons for believing that it was contained in it. On the other hand, the Apology gives no starting point for the attack of Celsus on Jewish prophecies about the Messiah, whereas the Preaching laid great stress on this point (see above, p. 89).

¹ Ap. c. x. εὶ οὂν Διόνυσος σφαγεὶς οὐκ ἡδυνήθη ἐαυτῷ βοηθῆσαι...πῶς ἂν εἴη θεός ; (et passim). Cf. δέσμιος and δραπέτης in the same chapter.

² Ap. c. xvi. δδεύοντες γάρ έν σκότει προσρήσσονται έαυτοῖς ώς μεθύοντες.

APOLOGIA ARISTIDIS

VT APVD HISTORIAM BARLAAM ET JOSAPHAT CONSERVATVR.

▼ Ι. 'Εγώ, βασιλεῦ, προνοία θεοῦ ἢλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον' καὶ 239 θεωρήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, ἥλιόν τε καὶ σελήνην καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, ἐθαύμασα τὴν διακόσμησιν τούτων. ἰδων δὲ τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα, ὅτι κατὰ ἀνάγκην κινεῖται, συνῆκα τὸν κινοῦντα καὶ διακρατοῦντα εἶναι θεόν πᾶν 5 γὰρ τὸ κινοῦν ἰσχυρότερον τοῦ κινουμένου, καὶ τὸ διακρατοῦν ἰσχυρότερον τοῦ διακρατουμένου ἐστίν. αὐτὸν οὖν λέγω εἶναι ⇒ θεὸν τὸν συστησάμενον τὰ πάντα καὶ διακρατοῦντα, ἄναρχον καὶ ἀἴδιον, ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀπροσδεῆ, ἀνώτερον πάντων τῶν παθῶν καὶ ἐλαττωμάτων, ὀργῆς τε καὶ λήθης καὶ ἀγνοίας καὶ τῶν 10 λοιπῶν. δὶ αὐτοῦ δὲ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκεν. οὐ χρήζει θυσίας καὶ σπονδῆς, οὐδέ τινος πάντων τῶν φαινομένων πάντες δὲ αὐτοῦ χρίζουσι.

ΙΙ. Τούτων οὕτως εἰρημένων περὶ θεοῦ, καθῶς ἐμὲ ἐχώρησε περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν, ἔλθωμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος, ὅπως 15 ἴδωμεν τίνες αὐτῶν μετέχουσι τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τίνες τῆς 240 πλάνης. φανερὸν γάρ ἐστιν ἡμῖν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, ὅτι τρία γένη εἰσὶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῷδε τῷ κόσμῳ· ὧν εἰσὶν οἱ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν λεγομένων θεῶν προσκυνηταὶ, καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ χριστιανοί αὐτοὶ δὲ πάλιν οἱ τοὺς πολλοὺς σεβόμενοι θεοὺς εἰς τρία 20 διαιροῦνται γένη, Χαλδαίους τε καὶ Ἔλληνας καὶ Αἰγυπτίους

² καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν] MP; καὶ γῆν καὶ Bois; γῆν καὶ W; sed cf. p. 101, l. 8 ἤλιόν τε] P Bois; ἤλιον MW 5 κινεῖται] κινοῦνται M 6 ἰσχυρώτερον M (et l. 7) 7, 8 θεὸν εῖναι M 11 θυσιῶν M 12 σπονδῆς] Bois; libamine lat; σπονδὰς PW; σπονδῶν M om. τινος MP Bois; sed aliquo lat 15 ἐπὶ] περὶ W 18 ἀνθρώπων] P Bois syr; om. MW lat ὑμῖν] ὑμῶν P Bois 21 διαίρονται P

οὖτοι γὰρ γεγόνασιν ἀρχηγοὶ καὶ διδάσκαλοι τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσι τῆς τῶν πολυωνύμων θεῶν λατρείας καὶ προσκυνήσεως.

ΙΙΙ. "Ιδωμεν οὖν τίνες τούτων μετέχουσι τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ π τίνες τῆς πλάνης.

ς Οί μεν γαρ Χαλδαίοι, μη είδότες θεον, επλανήθησαν οπίσω τών στοιχείων, καὶ ἤρξαντο σέβεσθαι τὴν κτίσιν παρά τὸν κτίσαντα αὐτούς · ὧν καὶ μορφώματά τινα ποιήσαντες ὧνόμασαν έκτύπωμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, ἡλίου τε καὶ σελήνης, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν στοιχείων ἢ φωστήρων, καὶ το συγκλείσαντες ναοίς προσκυνούσι θεούς καλούντες, ούς καὶ τηρούσιν ἀσφαλώς ἵνα μὴ κλαπώσιν ύπὸ ληστών, καὶ οὐ συνήκαν ότι παν τὸ τηροῦν μεῖζον τοῦ τηρουμένου ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁ 😙 ποιών μείζων έστὶ τοῦ ποιουμένου. εἰ γὰρ ἀδυνατοῦσιν οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν περὶ τῆς ιδίας σωτηρίας, πῶς ἄλλοις σωτηρίαν χαρί-15 σονται ; πλάνην οὖν μεγάλην ἐπλανήθησαν οἱ Χαλδαῖοι, σεβόμενοι αγάλματα νεκρά καὶ ανωφελή, καὶ θαυμάζειν μοι έπέρχεται, ὦ βασιλεῦ, πῶς οἱ λεγόμενοι φιλόσοφοι αὐτῶν οὐδ΄ ὅλως συνήκαν ὅτι καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα φθαρτά ἐστιν. εἰ δὲ τὰ στοιχεῖα φθαρτά ἐστι καὶ ὑποτασσόμενα κατὰ ἀνάγκην, 241 πως είσὶ θεοί; εί δὲ τὰ στοιχεία οὐκ είσὶ θεοὶ, πως τὰ ἀγάλματα, ά γέγονεν είς τιμην αὐτῶν, θεοὶ ὑπάργουσιν;

IV. "Ελθωμεν οὖν, ὧ βασιλεῦ, ἐπ' αὐτὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα, ὅπως ἀποδείξωμεν περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι οὖκ εἰσὶ θεοὶ, ἀλλὰ φθαρτὰ καὶ ἀλλοιούμενα, ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος παραχθέντα προστάγματι τοῦ 25 ὄντως θεοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ἄφθαρτός τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος καὶ ἀόρατος. α αὐτὸς δὲ πάντα ὁρᾳ, καὶ καθὼς βούλεται ἀλλοιοῖ καὶ μεταβάλλει. τί οὖν λέγω περὶ τῶν στοιχείων;

Οί νομίζοντες τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶναι θεὸν πλανῶνται. ὁρῶμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν τρεπόμενον καὶ κατὰ ἀνάγκην κινούμενον, καὶ ἐκ 30 πολλῶν συνεστῶτα διὸ καὶ κόσμος καλεῖται. κόσμος δὲ κατασκευή ἐστι τινὸς τεχνίτου τὸ κατασκευασθὲν δὲ ἀρχὴν καὶ

² πολυονύμων P 4 τίνες] $+\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ M 5 μη] οἱ μηὰ Bois 6 οm. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ M 7 κτίσαντα] $+\kappa \alpha \iota$ ποιήσαντα P 8 ἐκτύπωμα] MPV $_{omn}$; figuram lat; ἐκτυπώματα W Bois καὶ (see)] ημ MP 11 τηρούσων] συντηρούντες M 14 οm. ἰδίας P 14, 15 χαρίσωνται W* 18 οm. καὶ M 18, 19 om. φθαρτά ἐστιν. εἰ δὲ τὰ στοιχεῖα W 18-20 om. φθαρτά ἐστιν. εἰ-θεοί; εἰ δὲ τὰ στοιχεῖα P 24 ἀλλοιούμενα] ἀπολύμενα W ὅντος] ὄντως W* 25 ὄντως] ὅντος PW² 26 ὁρῶν P 30 om. καὶ PW lat

τέλος ἔχει. κινεῖται δὲ ὁ οὐρανὸς κατὰ ἀνάγκην σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῦ φωστῆρσι τὰ γὰρ ἄστρα τάξει καὶ διαστήματι φερόμενα ἀπὸ σημείου εἰς σημεῖον, οἱ μὲν δύνουσιν, οἱ δὲ ἀνατέλλουσι, καὶ κατὰ καιροὺς πορείαν ποιοῦνται τοῦ ἀποτελεῖν θέρη καὶ χειμῶνας, καθὰ ἐπιτέτακται αὐτοῖς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ παραβαίνουσι 5 τοὺς ἰδίους ὅρους, κατὰ ἀπαραίτητον φύσεως ἀνάγκην, σὺν τῷ οὐρανίῳ κόσμῳ. ὅθεν φανερόν ἐστι μὴ εἶναι τὸν οὐρανὸν θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

Οἱ δὲ νομίζοντες τὴν γῆν εἶναι θεὰν ἐπλανήθησαν. ὁρῶμεν γὰρ αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑβριζομένην καὶ κατακυριευομένην, 10 σκαπτομένην καὶ φυρομένην καὶ ἄχρηστον γινομένην. ἐὰν γὰρ ὀπτηθῆ, γίνεται νεκρά ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ ὀστράκου φύεται οὐδέν. ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ἐπὶ πλέον βραχῆ, φθείρεται καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ οἱ καρποὶ 242 αὐτῆς. καταπατεῖται δὲ ὑπό τε ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ζώων, αἵμασι φονευομένων μιαίνεται, διορύσσεται, γεμίζεται 15 νεκρῶν, θήκη γίνεται σωμάτων. τούτων οὕτως ὄντων, οὐκ ἐνδέ-χεται τὴν γῆν εἶναι θεὰν, ἀλλὶ ἔργον θεοῦ εἰς χρῆσιν ἀνθρώπων.

V. Οἱ δὲ νομίζοντες τὸ ὕδωρ εἶναι θεὸν ἐπλανήθησαν. καὶ αὐτὸ γὰρ εἰς χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων γέγονε, καὶ κατακυριεύεται ὑπ' αὐτῶν, μιαίνεται καὶ φθείρεται, καὶ ἀλλοιοῦται ἐψόμενον 20 καὶ ἀλλασσόμενον χρώμασι, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κρύους πηγνύμενον,
καὶ αἵμασι μολυνόμενον, καὶ εἰς πάντων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων πλύσιν ἀγόμενον. διὸ ἀδύνατον τὸ ὕδωρ εἶναι θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

Οἱ δὲ νομίζοντες τὸ πῦρ εἶναι θεὸν πλανῶνται. τὸ γὰρ πῦρ ἐγένετο εἰς χρῆσιν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ κατακυριεύεται ὑπ' 25 αὐτῶν, περιφερόμενον ἐκ τόπου εἰς τόπον εἰς ἔψησιν καὶ ὅπτησιν παντοδαπῶν κρεῶν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ νεκρῶν σωμάτων φθείρεται δὲ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σβεννύμενον. διὸ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται τὸ πῦρ εἶναι θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

Οί δὲ νομίζοντες τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων πνοὴν εἶναι θεὰν πλανῶνται. 30

1 οὐρανὸs] + καὶ W αὐτοῦ] ἐαυτοῦ PW 3 δύουσιν Bois ἀνατέλουσιν MW 5 καθὰ] καθ' δ W 11 οm. σκαπτομένην Bois (sed C habet) φυρομένην] Bois ; φυρουμένην PW; φρουρουμένην CM 11, 12 om. γινομένην—ὀπτηθŷ P 12 ἐκ γὰρ] καθότι ἐκ W om. τοῦ P 15 om. γεμίζεται Bois (sed C habet) 16 νεκρωθήκη P 19 om. τῶν PW 20 ἐψούμενον MPW 22 om. καὶ αἴμασι μολυνόμενον Bois V_{21} 22, 23 om. καὶ εἰς πάντων—ἀγόμενον M 24, 25 τὸ γὰρ πῦρ ἐγένετο εἰς χρῆσιν] καὶ αὐτὸ γὰρ εἰς χρῆσιν ἐγένετο Bois V_{21} 25 χρῆσιν] χρίσιν M 28 om. καὶ W σβενύμενον W

φανερον γάρ έστιν ὅτι δουλεύει ἑτέρφ, καὶ χάριν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατεσκεύασται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς μεταγωγὴν πλοίων καὶ συγκομιδὰς τῶν σιτικῶν, καὶ εἰς λοιπὰς αὐτῶν χρείας αὐξει τε καὶ λήγει κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ. διὸ οὐ νενόμισται τὴν τῶν 35 ἀνέμων πνοὴν εἶναι θεὰν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

VI. Οἱ δὲ νομίζοντες τὸν ἥλιον εἶναι θεὸν πλανῶνται. ὁρῶμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν κινούμενον κατὰ ἀνάγκην καὶ τρεπόμενον, καὶ
243 μεταβαίνοντα ἀπὸ σημείου εἰς σημεῖον, δύνοντα καὶ ἀνατέλλοντα,
τοῦ θερμαίνειν τὰ φυτὰ καὶ βλαστὰ εἰς χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
10 ἔτι δὲ καὶ μερισμὸν ἔχοντα μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀστέρων, καὶ
ἐλάττονα ὄντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πολὺ, καὶ ἐκλείποντα τοῦ φωτὸς,
καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοκράτειαν ἔχοντα. διὸ οὐ νενόμισται τὸν ἥλιον
εἶναι θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

Οἱ δὲ νομίζοντες τὴν σελήνην εἶναι θεὰν πλανῶνται. ὁρῶμεν 15 γὰρ αὐτὴν κινουμένην κατὰ ἀνάγκην καὶ τρεπομένην, καὶ μετα-βαίνουσαν ἀπὸ σημείου εἰς σημεῖον, δύνουσάν τε καὶ ἀνατέλ-λουσαν εἰς χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἐλάττονα οὖσαν τοῦ ἡλίου, αὐξομένην τε καὶ μειουμένην, καὶ ἐκλείψεις ἔχουσαν. διὸ οὐ νενόμισται τὴν σελήνην εἶναι θεὰν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

20 VII. Οί δὲ νομίζοντες τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι θεὸν πλανῶνται.
όρῶμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν κινούμενον κατὰ ἀνάγκην, καὶ τρεφόμενον καὶ γηράσκοντα, καὶ μὴ θέλοντος αὐτοῦ. καὶ ποτὰ μὲν χαίρει,
ποτὰ δὲ λυπεῖται, δεόμενος βρώματος καὶ ποτοῦ καὶ ἐσθῆτος.
εἶναι δὲ αὐτὸν ὀργίλον καὶ ζηλωτὴν καὶ ἐπιθυμητὴν, καὶ
25 μεταμελόμενον, καὶ ἐλαττώματα πολλὰ ἔχοντα. φθείρεται δὲ
κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους, ὑπὸ στοιχείων καὶ ζώων, καὶ τοῦ
ἐπικειμένου αὐτῷ θανάτου. οὐκ ἐνδέχεται οὖν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον
θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

Πλάνην οὖν μεγάλην ἐπλανήθησαν οἱ Χαλδαῖοι, ὀπίσω τῶν 30 ἐπιθυμημάτων αὐτῶν. σέβονται γὰρ τὰ φθαρτὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ 244 τὰ νεκρὰ ἀγάλματα, καὶ οὐκ αἰσθάνονται ταῦτα θεοποιούμενοι.

1 ἐτέρω] θεώ C 3 συγκομηδάς M; uentilationem lat σιτίων Bois $V_{71, \, 102}$ αὐξουμένην P 10 μερισμόν] W; diuisionem lat; μερισμόν MP Bois 16, 17 ἀνατέλουσαν M 17 χρῆσιν] W; χρείαν MP Bois 18 αὐξουμένην MPW Bois 22 καὶ ποτὲ μὲν χαίρει] deficit C usque ad καὶ εἰσὶ παράνομοι p. 110, l. 10 23 βρώματος] βρωμάτων Bois; ἄρτον W; cibo lat 24 ἐπιθυμητὴν καὶ ζηλωτὴν M 25 μετάμελον W; μεταβαλλόμενον P πολλά ἐλαττώματα Bois 27 ὑποκειμένου W; imminente lat 30 ἐπιθυμιῶν P

VIII. "Ελθωμεν οὖν ἐπὶ τοὺς "Ελληνας, ἵνα ἴδωμεν εἴ τι φρονούσι περί θεού. οί ούν "Ελληνες σοφοί λέγοντες είναι έμωράνθησαν χείρον των Χαλδαίων, παρεισάγοντες θεούς πολλούς γεγενήσθαι, τούς μεν άρρενας, τὰς δὲ θηλείας, παντοίων παθών καὶ παυτοδαπῶν δημιουργούς ἀνομημάτων. [οὺς ἐκεῖνοι αὐτοὶ [49] • ἐξέθεντο μοιχούς είναι καὶ φονείς, ὀργίλους καὶ ζηλωτάς καὶ θυμαντικούς, πατροκτόνους καὶ άδελφοκτόνους, κλέπτας καὶ άρπαγας, χωλούς καὶ κυλλούς, καὶ φαρμακούς, καὶ μαινομένους. καὶ τούτων τινὰς μεν τετελευτηκότας, τινὰς δὲ κεκεραυνωμένους καὶ δεδουλευκότας ἀνθρώποις, καὶ φυγάδας γενομένους, καὶ κο- 10 πτομένους καὶ θρηνουμένους, καὶ εἰς ζῶα μεταμορφουμένους ἐπὶ πονηραίς καὶ αἰσχραίς πράξεσιν.] ὅθεν γελοία καὶ μωρά καὶ ἀσεβή παρεισήγαγον οί "Ελληνες, βασιλεύ, ρήματα, τούς ~ μη όντας προσαγορεύοντες θεούς, κατά τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν τάς πονηράς, ίνα, τούτους συνηγόρους έχοντες τής κακίας, μοι- 15 χεύωσιν, άρπάζωσι, φονεύωσι, καὶ τὰ πάνδεινα ποιώσιν. εἰ γὰρ οί θεοί αὐτῶν τοιαῦτα ἐποίησαν, πῶς καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ τοιαῦτα πράξουσιν; ἐκ τούτων οὖν τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων τῆς πλάνης συνέβη τοις ανθρώποις πολέμους έχειν συχνούς, και σφαγάς και αίγμαλωσίας πικράς.

ΙΧ. 'Αλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν εἰ θελήσομεν ἐλθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ, πολλὴν ὄψει τὴν ἀτοπίαν· ὅπως παρεισάγεται αὐτοῖς πρὸ πάντων θεὸς Κρόνος, καὶ τούτῳ θύουσι τὰ ἴδια τέκνα· ὃς ἔσχε παῖδας πολλοὺς ἐκ τῆς 'Pέας, καὶ μανεὶς ἤσθιε τὰ ἴδια τέκνα. φασὶ δὲ τὸν Δία κόψαι αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀναγκαῖα καὶ βαλεῖν 25 εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὅθεν 'Αφροδίτη μυθεύεται γεννᾶσθαι. δήσας οὖν τὸν ἴδιον πατέρα ὁ Ζεὺς ἔβαλεν εἰς τὸν Τάρταρον. ὁρῆς 245 τὴν πλάνην καὶ ἀσέλγειαν ῆν παρεισάγουσι κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ

1 οὖν] καὶ PW; itaque lat 3 πολλοὺς θεοὺς Bois 4 τὰς] τοὺς Bois; alios lat 5 αὐτοὶ ἐκεῖνοι Μ 6 φωνεῖς, ὀργήλους Μ 7 καὶ ἀδελφοκτώνους] om. P syr; καὶ ἀδελφοκτώνους Μ 8 χωλοὺς—μαινομένους Ρ κυλλοὺς] κοιλοὺς Μ 9 καικεραυνωμένους Μ; κεραυνωμένους P 10, 11 καὶ κοπτ. καὶ θρην.] post κεκεραυνωμένους Bois 12 πράξεσιν] μίξεσιν Bois 15, 16 μοιχεύσωσιν, ἀρπάξωσι, φονεύσωσι Μ 16 πάνδεινα] πάντα δεινὰ P; δεινὰ πάντα Μ; οπιτία mala lat 18 πράξωσιν PW + εἰ γὰρ οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν ἄφρονες, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς ἔσονται W 19 τοὺς ἀνθρώπους Bois 21 om. καὶ PW lat 22 ὅπως] ὁ πρῶτος coniecit Bois; inducitur enim lat 23 θεὸς] + ὁ λεγόμενος Bois θύσωσι P 24 ἴσθιε Μ 25 τὸν Δία κόψαι] τοῦτον διακόψαι W² 26 ἀφροδίτην W Bois μηθύεται Μ; μυθύεσθαι Bois 27 ξβαλλεν W²

αὐτῶν; ἐνδέχεται οὖν θεὸν εἶναι δέσμιον καὶ ἀπόκοπον; ὢ τῆς ἀνοίας· τίς τῶν νοῦν ἐχόντων ταῦτα φήσειεν;

Δεύτερος παρεισάγεται ὁ Ζεὺς, ὃν φασὶ βασιλεῦσαι τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ μεταμορφοῦσθαι εἰς ζῶα, ὅπως μοιχεύση θνητὰς 5 γυναῖκας. παρεισάγουσι γὰρ τοῦτον μεταμορφούμενον εἰς ταῦρον πρὸς Εὐρώπην, καὶ εἰς χρυσὸν πρὸς Δανάην, καὶ εἰς κύκνον πρὸς Λήδαν, καὶ εἰς σάτυρον πρὸς ᾿Αντιόπην, καὶ εἰς κεραυνὸν πρὸς Σεμέλην εἰτα γενέσθαι ἐκ τούτων τέκνα πολλὰ, Διόνυσον καὶ Ζῆθον καὶ ᾿Αμφίονα καὶ Ἡρακλῆν καὶ ᾿Απόλλωνα καὶ το Ἦρεκιν καὶ Περσέα, Κάστορά τε καὶ Ἑλένην καὶ Πολυδεύκην, 246 καὶ Μίνωα καὶ Ῥαδάμανθυν καὶ Σαρπηδόνα, καὶ τὰς ἐννέα θυγατέρας ἃς προσηγόρευσαν Μούσας. εἰθ οὕτως παρεισάγουσι τὰ κατὰ τὸν Γανυμήδην. συνέβη οὖν, βασιλεῦ, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μιμεῖσθαι ταῦτα πάντα, καὶ γίνεσθαι μοιχοὺς καὶ ἀρρενομανεῖς, 15 καὶ ἄλλων δεινῶν ἔργων ἐργάτας, κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν. πῶς οὖν ἐνδέχεται θεὸν εἶναι μοιχὸν ἢ ἀνδροβάτην, ἢ πατροκτόνον:

Χ. Σὸν τούτφ δὲ καὶ "Ηφαιστόν τινα παρεισάγουσι θεὸν εἶναι, καὶ τοῦτον χωλὸν, καὶ κρατοῦντα σφῦραν καὶ πυρόλαβον,
 καὶ χαλκεύοντα χάριν τροφῆς. ἄρα ἐπενδεής ἐστιν; ὅπερ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται θεὸν εἶναι χωλὸν οὐδὲ προσδεόμενον ἀνθρώπων.

Εἶτα τὸν Ἑρμῆν παρεισάγουσι θεὸν εἶναι ἐπιθυμητὴν καὶ κλέπτην καὶ πλεονέκτην καὶ μάγον †καὶ κυλλὸν † καὶ λόγων το ἐρμηνευτήν. ὅπερ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται θεὸν εἶναι τοιοῦτον.

5 Τον δε 'Ασκληπιον παρεισάγουσι θεον είναι, ἰατρον ὅντα καὶ κατασκευάζοντα φάρμακα καὶ σύνθεσιν ἐμπλάστρων, χάριν τροφῆς ἐπενδεῆς γὰρ ἦν ὕστερον δὲ κεραυνοῦσθαι αὐτον ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς διὰ Τυνδάρεων Λακεδαίμονος υίὸν, καὶ ἀποθανεῖν. εἰ

² τῶν] τὸν W* 3, 4 τῶν θεῶν] τὸν θεὸν P 8 σημέλην P 9 ἀμφίωνα P ήρακλῆ M ἀπόλωνα MW 10 κάστωρα P πολυδευκῆ M 11 μήνωα PW οπ. καὶ (prim.) P σαρπιδόνα M ἐνέα W* 12 παρειάγουσι P 13 γανυμίδην P συνέβη] σέβη M 14 οπ. ταῦτα πάντα καὶ γίνεσθαι P 15 οπ. ἔργων Μ τοῦ θεοῦ] τῶν θεῶν AW syr; dei sui lat 18 τούτω] τούτοις W² παρεισάγουσί τινα M 20 ἐπιδεής W Bois 21 οὐδὲ] καὶ P Bois 23 κυλὸν W; uersipellem lat 23, 24 οπ. καὶ μάγον—ἐρμηνευτήν M 24 εἶναὶ] + τὸν P; + χωλὸν (κυλὸν W²) οὐδὲ προσδεόμενον ἀνθρώπων ὅπερ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται θεὸν εῖναι W 25 ἀσκήπιον M 27 ἐπιδεής W 28 τυνδάρεων] Bois; τυνδάρεω M; τυνδάρεως W²P; τοινδάρεως AW*; Darii lat

δὲ ᾿Ασκληπιὸς θεὸς ὢν καὶ κεραυνωθεὶς οὐκ ἡδυνήθη ἐαυτῷ βοηθῆσαι, πῶς ἄλλοις βοηθήσει;

"Αρης δὲ παρεισάγεται θεὸς εἶναι πολεμιστὴς καὶ ζηλωτὴς, 247 καὶ ἐπιθυμητὴς θρεμμάτων καὶ ἑτέρων τινῶν "ὕστερον δὲ αὐτὸν μοιχεύοντα τὴν 'Αφροδίτην δεθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ νηπίου 5 Ερωτος καὶ ὑπὸ Ἡφαίστου. πῶς οὖν θεὸς ἦν ὁ ἐπιθυμητὴς καὶ πολεμιστὴς καὶ δέσμιος καὶ μοιχός;

Τον δε Διόνυσον παρεισάγουσι θεον είναι, νυκτερινας ἄγοντα εορτας και διδάσκαλον μέθης, και ἀποσπώντα τὰς τῶν πλησίον γυναικας, και μαινόμενον και φεύγοντα· ὕστερον δε αὐτον 10 σφαγηναι ὑπὸ τῶν Τιτάνων. εἰ οὖν Διόνυσος σφαγεὶς οὐκ ηδυνήθη εαυτῷ βοηθησαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ μαινόμενος ην καὶ μέθυσος καὶ δραπέτης, πῶς αν εἰη θεός;

Τον δὲ Ἡρακλῆν παρεισάγουσι μεθυσθῆναι καὶ μανῆναι, καὶ τὰ ἴδια τέκνα σφάξαι, εἶτα πυρὶ ἀναλωθῆναι καὶ οὕτως $_{15}$ ἀποθανεῖν. πῶς δ' ἀν εἴη θεὸς, μέθυσος καὶ τεκνοκτόνος, καὶ κατακαιόμενος; ἡ πῶς ἄλλοις βοηθήσει, ἑαυτῷ βοηθῆσαι μὴ δυνηθείς;

ΧΙ. Τὸν δὲ ᾿Απόλλωνα παρεισάγουσι θεὸν εἶναι ζηλωτὴν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τόξον καὶ φαρέτραν κρατοῦντα, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ κιθάραν 20 καὶ †ἐπαυθίδα†, καὶ μαντευόμενον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις χάριν μισθοῦ. ἄρα ἐπενδεής ἐστιν; ὅπερ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται θεὸν εἶναι ἐνδεῆ καὶ ζηλωτὴν καὶ κιθαρωδόν.

"Αρτεμιν δὲ παρεισάγουσιν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ εἶναι, κυνηγὸν οὖσαν, καὶ τόξον ἔχειν μετὰ φαρέτρας' καὶ ταύτην ῥέμβεσθαι 25 κατὰ τῶν ὀρέων μόνην μετὰ τῶν κυνῶν, ὅπως θηρεύση ἔλαφον 248 ἢ κάπρον. πῶς οὖν ἔσται θεὸς ἡ τοιαύτη γυνὴ καὶ κυνηγὸς καὶ ῥεμβομένη μετὰ τῶν κυνῶν;

'Αφροδίτην δὲ λέγουσι καὶ αὐτὴν θεὰν εἶναι μοιχαλίδα. ποτὲ γὰρ ἔσχε μοιχὸν τὸν ''Αρην, ποτὲ δὲ 'Αγχίσην, ποτὲ δὲ 30 "Αδωνιν, οὖτινος καὶ τὸν θάνατον κλαίει, ζητοῦσα τὸν ἐραστὴν

1 ἢδυνήθει M αὐτῶ W 4 ἐπιθυμίτης M θρεμμάτων] χρημάτων V_{102} ; χρημάτων P_{102} γρημάτων P_{102} ; χρημάτων P_{102} γρημάτων P_{102}

αὐτῆς· ἡν λέγουσιν καὶ εἰς "Αδου καταβαίνειν, ὅπως ἐξαγοράση τὸν "Αδωνιν ἀπὸ τῆς Περσεφόνης. εἶδες, ὧ βασιλεῦ, μείζονα ταύτης ἀφροσύνην· θεὰν παρεισάγειν τὴν μοιχεύουσαν καὶ θρηνοῦσαν καὶ κλαίουσαν;

5 "Αδωνιν δὲ παρεισάγουσι θεὸν εἶναι κυνηγὸν, καὶ τοῦτον βιαίως ἀποθανεῖν πληγέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑὸς, καὶ μὴ δυνηθέντα βοηθῆσαι τῆ ταλαιπωρία αὐτοῦ. πῶς οὖν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μφροντίδα ποιήσεται ὁ μοιχὸς καὶ κυνηγὸς καὶ βιοθάνατος;

Ταῦτα πάντα καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ πολλῷ πλεῖον αἰσχρό10 τερα καὶ πονηρὰ παρεισήγαγον οἱ Ἑλληνες, βασιλεῦ, περὶ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, ἃ οἴτε λέγειν θέμις, οἴτ ἐπὶ μνήμης ὅλως φέρειν ὅθεν λαμβάνοντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀφορμὴν ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, ἔπραττον πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν καὶ ἀσέλγειαν καὶ ἀσέβειαν, καταμιαίνοντες γῆν τε καὶ ἀέρα ταῖς δειναῖς αὐτῶν πράξεσιν.

249 ΧΙΙ. Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ, ἀβελτερώτεροι καὶ ἀφρονέστεροι τούτων ὅντες, χεῖρον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπλανήθησαν. οὐ γὰρ ἠρκέσθησαν τοῖς τῶν Χαλδαίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων σεβάσμασιν, ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ ἄλογα ζῶα παρεισήγαγον θεοὺς εἶναι χερσαῖά τε καὶ ἔνυδρα, καὶ τὰ φυτὰ καὶ βλαστὰ, καὶ ἐμιάνθησαν ἐν πάση 20 μανία καὶ ἀσελγεία χεῖρον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Άρχαίως γὰρ ἐσέβοντο τὴν Ἱσιν, ἔχουσαν ἀδελφὸν καὶ ἄνδρα τὸν "Οσιριν, τὸν σφαγέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Τυφῶνος. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο φεύγει ἡ Ἱσις μετὰ "Ωρου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς εἰς Βύβλον τῆς Συρίας, ζητοῦσα τὸν "Οσιριν, καὶ 25 πικρῶς θρηνοῦσα, ἔως ηὕξησεν ὁ Ὠρος καὶ ἀπέκτεινε τὸν Τυφῶνα. οὔτε οὖν ἡ Ἱσις ἴσχυσε βοηθῆσαι τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀδελφῷ καὶ ἀνδρί οὔτε ὁ "Οσιρις σφαζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Τυφῶνος ἡδυνήθη ἀντιλαβέσθαι ἑαυτοῦ· οὔτε Τυφῶν ὁ ἀδελφοκτόνος, ἀπολλύμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ "Ωρου καὶ τῆς "Ισιδος, εὐπόρησε ῥύσασθαι ἑαυτὸν τοῦ

¹ ην] δν W* 2 ἴδες W 3 μοιχευομένην W² 5 άδώνην M 6 viòs W δυνηθήναι ΜΡ 7 βοηθήσαι post αὐτοῦ P βιαιοθάνατος Μ 9 πλείονα Ρ; έαυτοῦ Bois 8 ποιήσηται PW plura lat 10 παρεισάγουσιν Μ; παρήγαγον Ρ 12 των] του Ρ 14 καὶ] + τον P 15 άβελτερώτεροι] M Bois; άβελτώτεροι DW*; άβελτόπαρήγαγον W τεροι APW2 18 ἄλογα] ἄλλα Μ 20 έπὶ τῆς γῆς] έπι γῆς M ; τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς P ; ἐπλανήθησαν W 21 ἀρχαίως] ἀρχῆθεν Bois ; \mathring{a} δελ ϕ $\mathring{η}$ ν W 23 om. τ ο \hat{v} (prior.) Bois μ ετ \mathring{a}] $+\tau$ ο \hat{v} in principio lat 24 βίβλον MPW* om. καὶ P Bois τύφωνος καὶ W 25 θρηνοῦσα] 27 om. ὁ Μ 28 ἀπολλύμενος] Bois; ἀπολλόμενος MPW θανοῦσα W

θανάτου. καὶ ἐπὶ τοιούτοις ἀτυχήμασι γνωρισθέντες αὐτοὶ θεοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀσυνέτων Αἰγυπτίων ἐνομίσθησαν· οἴτινες, μηδ' 250 ἐν τούτοις ἀρκεσθέντες ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς σεβάσμασι τῶν ἐθνῶν, καὶ τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα παρεισήγαγον θεοὺς εἶναι.

Τινές γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐσεβάσθησαν πρόβατον, τινὲς δὲ τράγον, 5 ἔτεροι δὲ μόσχον καὶ τὸν χοῖρον, ἄλλοι δὲ τὸν κόρακα καὶ τὸν ἱέρακα καὶ τὸν γῦπα καὶ τὸν ἀετὸν, καὶ ἄλλοι τὸν κροκόδειλον, τινὲς δὲ τὸν αἴλουρον καὶ τὸν κύνα, καὶ τὸν λύκον καὶ τὸν πίθηκον, καὶ τὸν δράκοντα καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα, καὶ ἄλλοι τὸ κρόμυον καὶ τὸ σκόροδον καὶ ἀκάνθας, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κτίσματα. 10 καὶ οὐκ αἰσθάνονται οἱ ταλαίπωροι περὶ πάντων τούτων ὅτι οὐδὲν ἰσχύουσιν. ὁρῶντες γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν βιβρωσκομένους ὑπὸ ἐτέρων ἀνθρώπων καὶ καιομένους καὶ σφαττομένους καὶ σηπομένους, οὐ συνῆκαν περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ θεοί.

ΧΙΙΙ. Πλάνην οὖν μεγάλην ἐπλανήθησαν οἵ τε Αἰγύπτιοι 15 καὶ οί Χαλδαῖοι καὶ οί "Ελληνες τοιούτους παρεισάγοντες θεούς, καὶ ἀγάλματα αὐτῶν ποιοῦντες, καὶ θεοποιούμενοι τὰ κωφὰ καὶ ἀναίσθητα εἴδωλα. καὶ θαυμάζω πῶς ὁρῶντες τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν δημιουργῶν πριζομένους καὶ πελεκουμένους, καὶ κολοβουμένους, παλαιουμένους τε ύπὸ τοῦ χρόνου καὶ ἀναλυο- 20 μένους καὶ χωνευομένους, οὐκ ἐφρόνησαν περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐκ είσὶ θεοί. ὅτε γὰρ περὶ τῆς ιδίας σωτηρίας οὐδὲν ἰσχύουσι, πῶς των ανθρώπων πρόνοιαν ποιήσονται; αλλ' οί ποιηταί αὐτων καὶ φιλόσοφοι, τῶν τε Χαλδαίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων, θελήσαντες τοίς ποιήμασιν αὐτῶν καὶ συγγραφαίς σεμνύναι 25 τούς παρ' αὐτοῖς θεούς, μειζόνως τὴν αἰσχύνην αὐτῶν ἐξεκάλυψαν καὶ γυμνὴν πᾶσι προὔθηκαν. εἰ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολυμερές ου οὐκ ἀποβάλλεταί τι τῶν ἰδίων μελῶν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς πάντα τὰ μέλη ἀδιάρρηκτον ἕνωσιν ἔχον ἑαυτῷ ἐστὶ σύμφωνον, 251 πώς ἐν Φύσει θεοῦ μάγη καὶ διαφωνία ἔσται τοσαύτη; εἰ γὰρ 30

^{2,} $3 \cdot \mu \eta \delta' \ \epsilon V$] $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \ W$ 4 om. $\theta \epsilon o \delta's \ \epsilon \ell v a \iota \ MW^*; \ deos \ esse \ lat$ 7 κορκόδηλον W 8 om. $\tau \delta \nu$ (prim.) PW ελουρον W^* om. $\tau \delta \nu$ (sec.) MPW 9 $\pi \ell \theta \eta \kappa a \ W$ κα ℓ $\tau \delta \nu$ δράκοντα] δράκοντα δε P; om. $\tau \delta \nu$ M 10 κρόμμυον M σκόρδον M ἀκάνθας] Bois; ἄκανθα PW; ἄκανθον M; spinas lat 11 $\dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu o \nu \tau o P$ 14 $\sigma \eta \pi o \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \nu s$] + κα ℓ P 16 om. of (sec.) W 19 $\pi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \kappa \omega \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \nu s$ Bois 19, 20 om. κα ℓ κολοβουμ $\ell \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \nu s$ Bois 20 κολοβωμ $\ell \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \nu s$ M 20, 21 ἀναλλοιουμ $\ell \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \nu s$ κα ℓ χον $\ell \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \nu s$ M 29 εχων M* 30 τοσα $\ell \tau \eta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a \iota PW$

μία φύσις των θεων ύπηρχεν, οὐκ ὤφειλεν θεὸς θεὸν διώκειν, οὔτε σφάζειν, οὔτε κακοποιεῖν εἰ δὲ οἱ θεοὶ ὑπὸ θεων ἐδιώχθησαν καὶ ἐσφάγησαν, καὶ ἡρπάγησαν καὶ ἐκεραυνώθησαν, οὖκ ἔτι μία φύσις ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ γνωμαι διηρημέναι, πᾶσαι κακοποιοί " ὥστε 5 οὖδεὶς ἐξ αὐτων ἐστὶ θεός. φανερὸν οὖν ἐστὶν, ὧ βασιλεῦ, πλάνην εἶναι πᾶσαν τὴν περὶ των θεων φυσιολογίαν.

Πῶς δὲ οὐ συνῆκαν οἱ σοφοὶ καὶ λόγιοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὅτι νόμους θέμενοι κρίνονται ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων νόμων; εἰ γὰρ οἱ νόμοι δίκαιοί εἰσιν, ἄδικοι πάντως οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν εἰσὶ, παράνομα καὶ ποιήσαντες, ἀλληλοκτονίας καὶ φαρμακείας καὶ μοιχείας καὶ κλοπὰς καὶ ἀρσενοκοιτίας. εἰ δὲ καλῶς ἔπραξαν ταῦτα, οἱ νόμοι ἄρα ἄδικοί εἰσι, κατὰ τῶν θεῶν συντεθέντες. νυνὶ δὲ οἱ νόμοι καλοί εἰσι καὶ δίκαιοι, τὰ καλὰ ἐπαινοῦντες καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀπαγορεύοντες τὰ δὲ ἔργα τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν παράνομα παρά-15 νομοι ἄρα οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔνοχοι πάντες θανάτου καὶ ἀσεβεῖς οἱ τοιούτους θεοὺς παρεισάγοντες. εἰ μὲν γὰρ μυθικαὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτῶν ἱστορίαι, οὐδέν εἰσιν εἰ μὴ μόνον λόγοι εἰ δὲ φυσικαὶ, οὐκ ἔτι θεοί εἰσιν οἱ ταῦτα ποιήσαντες καὶ παθόντες εἰ δὲ ἀλληγορικαὶ, μῦθοί εἰσι καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο τι.

- 252 ΧΙΥ. 'Αποδέδεικται τοίνυν, & βασιλεῦ, ταῦτα πάντα τὰ πολύθεα σεβάσματα πλάνης ἔργα καὶ ἀπωλείας ὑπάρχειν. οὐ χρὴ γὰρ θεοὺς ὀνομάζειν ὁρατοὺς καὶ μὴ ὁρῶντας ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀόρατον καὶ πάντα ὁρῶντα καὶ πάντα δημιουργήσαντα δεῦ θεὸν σέβεσθαι.
 - 25 "Ελθωμεν οὖν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ὅπως ἴδωμεν τί φρονοῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ περὶ θεοῦ. οὖτοι γὰρ, τοῦ ʿΑβραὰμ ΄ ὅντες ἀπόγονοι καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακωβ, παρώκησαν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐκεῦθεν δὲ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν χειρὶ κραταιῷ καὶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ διὰ Μωσέως τοῦ νομοθέτου αὐτῶν, καὶ τέρασι 30 πολλοῦς καὶ σημείοις ἐγνώρισεν αὐτοῦς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν.
 - 1 ὑπεῖρχεν ὡκ Μ διώκην Μ 2 εἰ] Oἰ M (O rubr.) οἰ] supra lin, e pri, manu M 4 κακοποιαὶ PW² 5 φανερὰν W οm. ἐστὶν MW² 7 ὅτι] + καὶ οἱ coniecit Bois 9 πάντως] πάντες W om. εἰσὶ W* 10 φαρμακίας P Bois 11 ἀρσενοκοιτείας Μ 14 εἰ τὰ ἔργα δὲ Μ 15 ἄρα] + καὶ P 17, 18 οm. εἰ μὴ—θεοί εἰσιν Μ 18 ταῦτα] τοιαῦτα Μ 20 ἀποδέδεικται cum preced. W 21 ὑπάρχει W² 22 γὰρ] οὖν Bois 23 πάντα ὀρῶντα καὶ πάντα] πάντα ὀρῶντα καὶ πάντας P; πάντας Bois 24 σέβεσθαι θεόν Bois 26, 27 ὄντες τοῦ ἀβραὰμ P 27 om. καὶ (prior) P $l\sigma$ αὰκ] + τε P Bois

ἀλλὰ, ἀγνώμονες καὶ αὐτοὶ φανέντες καὶ ἀχάριστοι, πολλάκις ἐλάτρευσαν τοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν σεβάσμασι, καὶ τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ δικαίους ἀπέκτειναν. εἶτα ὡς εὐδόκησεν ὁ υίὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐμπαροινήσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν προέδωκαν Πιλάτω τῷ ἡγεμόνι τῶν 'Ρωμαίων καὶ σταυρῷ 5 κατεδίκασαν, μὴ αἰδεσθέντες τὰς εὐεργεσίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἀναρίθμητα θαύματα ἄπερ ἐν αὐτοῖς εἰργάσατο· καὶ ἀπώλοντο τῆ ἰδία παρανομία, σέβονται γὰρ καὶ νῦν τὸν θεὸν μόνον παντοκράτορα, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν· τὸν γὰρ χριστὸν ἀρνοῦνται τὸν υίὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ εἰσὶ παρόμοιοι τῶν ἐθνῶν, κἂν το ἐγγίζειν πως τῆ ἀληθεία δοκῶσιν, ῆς ἑαυτοὺς ἐμάκρυναν. ταῦτα περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

ΧV. Οί δὲ χριστιανοὶ γενεαλογοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστού. οὖτος δὲ ὁ υίὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου ὁμολογεῖται ἐν πνεύματι άγίω ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ καταβάς διὰ τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν 253 ανθρώπων καὶ έκ παρθένου άγίας γεννηθείς, άσπόρως τε καὶ άφθόρως, σάρκα ἀνέλαβε, καὶ ἀνεφάνη ἀνθρώποις, ὅπως ἐκ τῆς 3 πολυθέου πλάνης αὐτοὺς ἀνακαλέσηται, καὶ τελέσας τὴν θαυμαστήν αὐτοῦ οἰκονομίαν, διὰ σταυροῦ θανάτου ἐγεύσατο έκουσία βουλή κατ' οἰκονομίαν μεγάλην· μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας 20 ανεβίω καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνηλθεν. οὖ τὸ κλέος της παρουσίας έκ της παρ' αὐτοῖς καλουμένης εὐαγγελικης άγίας γραφης έξεστί σοι γνώναι, βασιλεύ, έὰν ἐντύχης. οὖτος δώδεκα ἔσχε μαθητάς, οί μετά την έν ουρανοίς άνοδον αυτού έξηλθον είς τας έπαρχίας της οἰκουμένης, καὶ ἐδίδαξαν την ἐκείνου μεγαλωσύνην καθάπερ 25 είς έξ αὐτῶν τὰς καθ' ἡμᾶς περιῆλθε χώρας, τὸ δόγμα κηρύττων της άληθείας. όθεν οἱ εἰσέτι διακονοῦντες τῆ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτῶν καλοῦνται χριστιανοί.

Καὶ οὖτοί εἰσιν οἱ ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς εὑρόντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν· γινώσκουσι γὰρ τὸν θεὸν κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν 30 τῶν ἀπάντων ἐν υἱῷ μονογενεῖ καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, καὶ ἄλλον

¹ αχάριστοι] ἄχρηστοι Bois 3, 4 ηὐδώκησεν P 5 om. τ $\hat{\wp}$ M ήγημόνι P 7 καὶ] διὸ P Bois 8 θεὸν τὸν μόνον Bois 9 παντοκράτωρα PW* 10 παρόμοιοι] παρόμηοι M ; παράνομοι W* τοῖς ἔθνεσι Bois κᾶν] καὶ W² 11 δοκῶσιν W* 14 om. ὁ P 17 ἀδιαφθόρως W² 18 αὐτοὺς πλάνης P 19 αὐτοῦ] + μεγάλην W θανάτον W 20 μεγάλιν W 22 om. ἀγίας M 23 om. γνῶναι W τύχης W* ἔσχε δώδεκα P 25 μεγαλοσύνην PW* 29 om. οἱ P 30 θεὸν] + εἶναι W² 31 μονογενῆ PW²

θεὸν πλήν τούτου οὐ σέβονται. ἔχουσι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις κεχαραγμένας, καὶ ταύτας φυλάττουσι, προσδοκώντες ανάστασιν νεκρών καὶ ζωήν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰώνος, οὐ μοιχεύουσιν, οὐ πορνεύουσιν, οὐ 5 ψευδομαρτυροῦσιν, οὐκ ἐπιθυμοῦσι τὰ ἀλλότρια, τιμῶσι πατέρα καὶ μητέρα, καὶ τοὺς πλησίον φιλοῦσι, δίκαια κρίνουσιν, ὅσα οὖ θέλουσιν αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι έτέρω οὐ ποιοῦσι, τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας αὐτούς παρακαλοῦσι καὶ προσφιλεῖς αὐτούς έαυτοῖς ποιοῦσι, 32 τούς έχθρούς εὐεργετεῖν σπουδάζουσι, πραεῖς εἰσὶ καὶ ἐπιεικεῖς, 254 ἀπὸ πάσης συνουσίας ἀνόμου καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας έγκρατεύονται, χήραν ούχ ύπερορωσιν, όρφανὸν οὐ λυποῦσιν ό έχων τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι ἀνεπιφθόνως ἐπιχορηγεῖ ξένον ἐὰν ίδωσιν, ύπὸ στέγην εἰσάγουσι, καὶ χαίρουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ώς έπι άδελφω άληθινω. ου γάρ κατά σάρκα άδελφούς έαυτούς 15 καλοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ψυχήν. ἕτοιμοί εἰσιν ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν προέσθαι· τὰ γὰρ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ ασφαλώς φυλάττουσιν, όσίως καὶ δικαίως ζώντες, καθώς κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς προσέταξεν, εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ κατὰ τος πασαν ώραν εν παντί βρώματι καί ποτώ καί τοίς λοιποίς 20 ἀγαθοίς.

XVI. "Οντως οὖν αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, ἥτις τοὺς όδεὐοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν, τὴν ἐπηγγελμένην παρὰ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῆ μελλούση ζωῆ. καὶ ἵνα ΔΔ γνῷς, βασιλεῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ταῦτα λέγω, ταῖς γραφαῖς 25 ἐγκύψας τῶν χριστιανῶν εὑρήσεις οὐδὲν ἔξω τῆς ἀληθείας με λέγειν.

Καλώς οὖν συνῆκεν ὁ υίός σου, καὶ δικαίως ἐδιδάχθη τοῦ λατρεύειν ζώντι θεῷ καὶ σωθῆναι εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα ἐπέρχεσθαι αἰῶνα. μεγάλα γὰρ καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν χριστιανῶν 30 λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα· οὐ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ῥήματα λαλοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἔθνη πλανῶνται, καὶ πλανῶσιν

έαυτούς· όδεύοντες γάρ εν σκότει προσρήσσονται έαυτοίς ώς μεθύοντες.

XVII. "Έως ὧδε ὁ πρὸς σέ μου λόγος, βασιλεῦ, ὁ ὑπὸ τῆς τὰ ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νοι μου ὑπαγορευθείς. διὸ παυσάσθωσαν οἰ ἀνόητοί σου σοφοὶ ματαιολογοῦντες κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου· συμφέρει 5 γὰρ ὑμῖν θεὸν κτίστην σέβεσθαι καὶ τὰ ἄφθαρτα αὐτοῦ 255 ἐνωτίζεσθαι ῥήματα, ἵνα, κρίσιν ἐκφυγόντες καὶ τιμωρίας, ζωῆς ἀνωλέθρου δειχθείητε κληρονόμοι.

1 προσρήσσοντες P 6 ήμ $\hat{\mu}$ ν W ἄφθαρτα] ἄφραστα W 7 τιμωρίας] MPW²; tormenta lat; τιμωρίαν W* Bois 8 ἀνολέθρου M

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

Αβραάμ 109, 26 άγάλματα 101, 20; 108, 17; άγ. νεκρά 101, 16; 103, 31 άγνώμων 110, 1 'Αγχίσης 106, 30 άδελφοκτόνος 104, 7; 107, 28 "Αδης 107, 1 άδιάρρηκτος 108, 29 άδυνατείν περί 101, 13 "Αδωνις 106, 31; 107, 2, 5 άετός worshipped 108, 7 Αἰγύπτιος 100, 21; 107, 15; 108, 2, 15, 24 Αίγυπτος 109, 27 αίλουρος worshipped 108, 8 αίχμαλωσίαι πικραί 104, 20 äκανθα worshipped 108, 10 άλλάσσεσθαι 102, 21 άλληγορικός 109, 19 άλληλοκτονία 109, 10 άλλοιοῦν 101, 24, 26; 102, 20 'Αμφίων 105, 9 άναβιοῦν 110, 21 άναγκαΐα 104, 25 άνάγκην, κατά 100, 4; 101, 19, 29; 102, 1, 6; 103, 7, 15, 21 άναίσθητος 108, 18 άναλαμβάνειν, σάρκα 110, 17 άναλλοίωτος 101, 25 ἄναρχος 100, 8 ἀνάστασις νεκρών 111, 3 άνδροβάτης 105, 16 άνεπιφθόνως 111, 12

άβελτερώτερος 107, 15

άντιλαμβάνεσθαι έαυτοῦ 107, 27 'Αντιόπη 105, 7 ανωλέθρου ζωής 112, 8 ανωφελής 101, 16 άδρατος 101, 25; 109, 23 άπαραίτητος 102, 6 άποβάλλεσθαι, mid. 108, 28 άπόγονος 109, 27 άπόκοπος 105, 1 'Απόλλων 105, 9; 106, 19 άποτελείν θέρη και χειμώνας 102, 4 άπροσδεής 100, 9 "April 106, 3, 30 άρρενομανής 105, 14 άρσενοκοιτία 109, 11 "Αρτεμις 105, 10; 106, 24 άρχαίως 107, 21 άρχηγός 101, 1 'Ασκληπιός 105, 25; 106, 1 άσπίς worshipped 108, 9 άσπόρως τε καὶ ἀφθόρως 110, 16 ἀτύχημα 108, 1 αὐτοκράτεια 103, 12 άφορμή 107, 12 'Αφροδίτη 104, 26; 106, 5, 29 άφροσύνη 107, 3 άχάριστος 110, 1 ἄχρηστος 102, 11

βιαίως 107, 6 βιβρώσκεσθαι 108, 12 βιοθάνατος 107, 8 βλαστά ν. φυτά βοηθεῖν 107, 7, 26; ἐαυτῷ 106, 2, 17; ἄλλοις 106, 2, 17 Βύβλος 107, 24

ανοδος, ή έν οὐρανοῖς 110, 24

Γανυμήδης 105, 13 γεμίζεσθαι 102, 15 γενεαλογεῖσθαι 110, 13 γραφῆς εὐαγγελικῆς ἀγίας 110, 22; αί γρ. τῶν χρ. 111, 24 γύψ worshipped 108, 7

Δανάη 105, 6 δέσμιος, of a god 105, 1; 106, 7 δημιουργείν 109, 23 δημιουργός 104, 5; 108, 19; of God 110, 30 διακονείν τη δικαιοσύνη 110, 27 διακόσμησις 100, 3 διακρατείν 100, 5, 6, 7, 8 διάστημα 102, 2 διαφωνία 108, 30 Διόνυσος 105, 8; 106, 8, 11 διορύσσεσθαι 102, 15 δόγμα, τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας 110, 26 δουλεύειν, of wind 103, 1; of gods 104, 10 δράκων worshipped 108, 9 $\delta \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \tau \eta s$, of a god 106, 13

έγγίζειν τη άληθεία 110, 11 έγκύπτειν ταις γραφαίς 111, 25 εϊδωλον 108, 18 έκουσία βουλή 110, 20 έκτύπωμα 101, 8 *ϵ*λάττωμα 100, 10; 103, 25 Έλένη 105, 10 "Ελληνες 100, 21; 104, 1, 2, 13; 107, 10, 17; 108, 16, 24; 109, 7 έμπαροινείν 110, 4 ξμπλαστρον 105, 26 ένδεής 106, 23 έντυγχάνειν, γραφή 110, 23 ἔνυδρος 107, 19 ένωσις 108, 29 ένωτίζεσθαι 112, 7 έπαρχίαι της οίκουμένης 110, 24 †έπανθίδα 106, 21 $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\nu\delta\epsilon\dot{\eta}$ s 105, 20, 27; 106, 22 έπίγνωσιν, κατά 110, 9 έπιεικής 111, 9

 $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \eta \tau \eta s$ 103, 24; 105, 22; 106, 4, 6

έπικειμένου αὐτῷ θανάτω 103, 27

έπιτήδευμα 104, 18 έπιχορηγεῖν 111, 12 ἔργον θεοῦ 102, 8, 17, 23, 29; 103, 5, 13, 19, 28 ἐρμηνευτὴς λόγων 105, 24 Ἑρμῆς 105, 22 Ἔρως 106, 6 εὐαγγελικῆς ἀγίας γραφῆς 110, 22 εὐδοκεῖν 110, 3 εὐεργεσία 110, 6 εὐπρεῖν 107, 29 Εὐρώπη 105, 6 εὐχαριστεῖν 111, 18

Zεύs 104, 25, 27; 105, 3, 28 Ζήθοs 105, 9 ζηλωτήs 103, 24; 104, 6; 106, 3, 19, 23

Ἡρακλῆς 105, 9; 106, 14 "Ηφαιστος 105, 18; 106, 6

θεοποιεῖσθαι 103, 31; 108, 17 θήκη 102, 16 θρέμματα 106, 4 θυμαντικός 104, 7 θυσία 100, 11

'Ιακώβ 109, 27 ἰέραξ worshipped 108, 7 'Ιησοῦς 110, 12; 111, 2 'Ιουδαῖοι 100, 19; 109, 25; 110, 12 'Ισαάκ 109, 27 'Ίσις 107, 21, 23, 26, 29 ἰστορία 109, 17

κακοποιεῖν 109, 2 κακοποιός 109, 4 Κάστωρ 105, 10 καταδικάζειν 110, 6 κατακαίεσθαι 106, 17 κατακυριεύεσθαι 102, 10, 19, 25 καταμιαίνειν 107, 18 καταπατεῖσθαι 102, 14 κεραυνοῦσθαι 104, 9; 105, 27; 106, 1; 109, 3 κήρυγμα 110, 28 κιθαρφδός 106, 23 κλέος τῆς παρουσίας 110, 21 κολοβοῦσθαι 108, 20 κόραξ worshipped 108, 6 κόσμος (emph.) 101, 30; κ. οὐράνιος 102, 7 κροκόδειλος worshipped 108, 7 κρόμυον worshipped 108, 10 Κρόνος 104, 23 κυνηγός 106, 24, 27; 107, 5, 8 κύων worshipped 108, 8

Λακεδαίμων 105, 28 Λήδα 105, 7 λύκος worshipped 108, 8

μάγος 105, 23

μακρύνειν ἐαυτόν 110, 11 ματαιολογείν 112, 5 μεγαλωσύνη 110, 25 μεθύειν 106, 14; 112, 2 $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \sigma os$, of a god 106, 12, 16 μειοῦσθαι 103, 18 μερισμός 103, 10 μεταγωγή 103, 2 μεταμέλεσθαι 103, 25 μεταμορφοῦσθαι 104, 11; 105, 4, 5 μετέχειν της άληθείας 100, 16; 101, 3 μίμησις 105, 15 Μίνως 105, 11 μολύνεσθαι 102, 22 μονογενής, υίδς 110, 31 μόρφωμα 101, 7 μόσχος worshipped 108, 6 Μοῦσαι 105, 12 μυθεύεσθαι 104, 26 μυθικός 109, 16 $\mu \hat{v} \theta os 109, 19$ $M\omega\sigma\hat{\eta}s$ 109, 29

νομοθέτης 109, 29 νυκτεριναί έορταί 106, 8

όδεύειν 111, 22; όδ. έν σκότει 112, 1 όδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας 111, 21 οἰκονομία 110, 19, 20 οἰκονμένη 110, 25 ὁμολογεῖσθαι 110, 14 ὀργίλος 103, 24; 104, 6 ὀρφανός 111, 11 "Οσιρις 107, 22, 24, 27 όσίως καὶ δικαίως 111, 17 ὄστρακον 102, 12

παλαιοῦσθαι 108, 20 πάνδεινος 104, 16 $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \circ \delta \alpha \pi \delta s$ 102, 27; 104, 5 παντοκράτωρ 110, 9 παράγεσθαι, έκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος 101, 24 παρακαλείν, τούς άδικοῦντας 111, 8 παρεισάγειν 104, 3, 13, 22, 28; 105, 3, 5, 12, 18, 22, 25; 106, 3, 8, 14, 19, 24; 107, 3, 5, 10, 18; 108, 4, 16; 109, 16 παρθένος άγία 110, 16 παροικείν 109, 27 παρόμοιος 110, 10 παρουσία 110, 21 πατροκτόνος 104, 7; 105, 16 πελεκοῦσθαι 108, 19 Περσεύς 105, 10 Περσεφόνη 107, 2 $\pi i\theta \eta \kappa os$ worshipped 108, 9 Πιλάτος 110, 5 πλανᾶν 111, 31; πλανᾶσθαι 101, 28; 102, 9, 18, 24, 30; 103, 6, 14, 20; 107, 16; 111, 31; πλανᾶσθαι ὀπίσω 101, 5; 103, 29; πλάνην πλανᾶσθαι 101, 15; 103, 29; 108, 15 πλεονέκτης 105, 23 πλύσις 102, 22 πνεῦμα ἄγιον 110, 15, 31 πνοή, ἀνέμων 102, 30; 103, 5ποίημα 108, 25 ποιητής 108, 23 πολεμιστής 106, 3, 7 Πολυδεύκης 105, 10 πολύθεος 109, 21; 110, 18πολυμερής 108, 28 πολυώνυμος 101, 2 πρίζεσθαι 108, 19 πρόβατον worshipped 108, 5 προέσθαι, ψυχήν 111, 16 $\pi \rho \acute{o} \nu o \iota a$ 100, 1; 108, 23 προσδεόμενος ἀνθρώπων 105, 21 προσκύνησις 101, 2 προσκυνητής 100, 19 προσρήσσεσθαι έαυτοις 112, 1 πρόσταγμα 101, 24; 111, 16

προσφιλείς ποιείν 111, 8 προφήτης 110, 3 πυρόλαβον 105, 19

'Ραδάμανθυς 105, 11 'Ρέα 104, 24 | ἡέμβεσθαι 106, 25, 28 | ἡύεσθαι ἐαυτόν 107, 29 'Ρωμαῖοι 110, 5

Σαρπηδών 105, 11 σάρκα ἀνέλαβε 110, 17 σάτυρος 105, 7 σεβάζεσθαι 108, 5 $\sigma \in \beta \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$ 107, 17; 108, 3; 109, 21; 110, 2 $\Sigma \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda n$ 105, 8 σημείον, of the zodiac 102, 3 bis: 103. 8 bis, 16 bis; τέρασι καὶ σ. 109, 30 σήπεσθαι 108, 14 σιτικά 103, 3 σκόροδον worshipped 108, 10 $\sigma\pi o\nu\delta\dot{\eta}$ 100, 12 σταυρός 110, 5, 19 $\sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \eta$ 111, 13 στοιχείον 101, 6, 9, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27; 103, 26, 30 συγγραφή 108, 25 συγκλείειν 101, 10 συγκομιδή 103, 3 συνήγορος 104, 15 σύνθεσις έμπλάστρων 105, 26 συνουσία ἄνομος 111, 10 Συρία 107, 24 σφάττεσθαι 108, 13 $\sigma\phi\hat{v}\rho\alpha$ 105, 19

ταλαιπωρία 107, 7 ταλαίπωρος 108, 11 Τάρταρος 104, 27 τεκνοκτόνος 106, 16 τηρεῖν 101, 11, 12 bis Τιτάνες 106, 11 τράγος worshipped 108, 5 τροφής, χάριν 105, 20, 27 Τυνδάρεως 105, 28 Τυφών 107, 23, 25, 27, 28

 \dot{v} βρίζεσθαι, τὴν γ ῆν 102, 10 \dot{v} 105 τοῦ θεοῦ 110, 4, 10, 14; μονογενὴς \dot{v} . 110, 31

φαινόμενα 100, 12 φαρέτρα 106, 20, 25 φθαρτός 101, 18, 19, 23; 103, 30 φθείρεσθαι 102, 13, 20, 27; 103, 25 φιλόσοφος 101, 17; 108, 24 φυρέσθαι 102, 11 φυσικός 109, 17 φυσιλογία 109, 6 φυτὰ καὶ βλαστά 103, 9; 107, 19 φωστῆρες 101, 9; 102, 2

Χαλδαΐοι 100, 21; 101, 5, 15; 103, 29; 104, 3; 107, 17; 108, 16, 24 χαράσσεσθαι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις 111, 2 χαρίζομαι 101, 14 χειραγωγεῖν 111, 22 χεραῖος 107, 18 χήρα 111, 11 χοῖρος worshipped 108, 6 χρῆσιν, εἰς 102, 17, 19, 25; 103, 9, 17 Χριστιανοί 100, 19; 110, 13, 28; 111, 25, 29 Χριστός 110, 9, 14; 111, 2, 15, 23 χρῶμα 102, 21 χωνεύεσθαι 108, 21 χωρεῖν 100, 14

ψευδομαρτυρείν 111, 5

 $\Omega_{\rho os}$ 107, 23, 25, 29

INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER.

Ambrose; Hypomnemata, 71 ff.

Anima, De; Syriac MS. of, 5

Antoninus Pius; his journeys to the East, 16 f.

Aphrodite, cult of, 60 f.

Apology of Aristides; discovery of Syriac Version, 3; description of MS., 3 ff.; discussion of title, 7 ff., 52, 75; contains traces of a Creed, 13, 23 ff.; possible existence of original Greek, 18 f.; transl. of Armenian fragment, 27 ff.; transl. of Syriac Version, 35 ff.; notes on, 52 ff.; remains of original Greek, 67 ff.; how far modified, 70 f.; criticism of Syriac Version, 71 ff.; its comparative faithfulness, 80, 90; the Apology and the Canon, 82 ff.; its use of the Two Ways, 84 ff.; and of the Preaching of Peter, 86 ff.; possibly used by Celsus, 19 ff., 98; text of the Greek, 100 ff.

Aristides; our previous knowledge of, 1, 18; Eusebian account of, 6 ff.; to whom he presented his Apology, 7 ff.; 52, 75

Armenian fragment of the Apology; previous criticisms of, 2; whether translated from the Greek, 26, 74 ff.; Latin transl. of, 27 ff.; English transl. of, 30 ff.; compared with Syriac and Greek, 75 ff.; other fragments, 33 f.

Barlaam and Josaphat; embodies our Apology, 67; outline of the story, 68 ff.; condition of Greek text, 80 ff.; MSS. used for the text of the Apology, 81 f. Bezae, Codex; parallel quoted from, 86

Canon; bearing of the Apology on, 82 ff. Celsus; possibly used the Apology, 19; points in common with it, 20 ff.; possibly used the Preaching of Peter, 98 f.

Cephas, Bar; quotation from the Hexaemeron of, 53

Christians; a third race, 70, 77, 88, 90 Christology of Aristides; the term Theotokos, 2, 3, 79; discussion of main passage, 78 f.

Chrysostom; Syriac MS. of Hom. in Matth., 6

Creed; known to Aristides in some form, 13 ff., 23 ff.

Crucifixion; attributed to the Jews, 14, 55 f., 84

Didaché; parallels with the Apology, 63; the Two Ways used by Aristides, 84 ff.; relation of Didaché and Barnabas to the Two Ways, 85 f.

Diognetus, Epistle to; Doulcet's theory criticised, 54, 64; used the Preaching of Peter, 95 ff.

Division of mankind into three races, 70, 77, 90

Eusebius; on the date of Aristides, 6, 9; on Quadratus, 10 f.

Fasting; Hermas and Aristides compared, 15

Fathers; Syriac Lives of, 4

Gentiles, Oratio ad; see Hypomnemata Golden Rule; negative form of, 62, 86 Gospels; referred to by Aristides, 82

Hermits; Syriac Lives of Egyptian, 4 Hypomnemata of Ambrose; Syriac compared with Greek, 71 ff.

John; Acts of, 14 f.
John the Solitary; Syriac MS. of, 5
Justin Martyr; parallels with our Apology, 53 ff.

Lucius (Lucianus); Syriac MS. of, 5

Magdalen College, Oxford; MS. of B. and J., 81 f.

Margoliouth, Prof.; criticism of emendation by, 58

Nilus; Syriac MS. of, 4

Paradisi Liber; Syriac MS. of, 4 Pembroke College, Cambridge; MS. of B. and J., 82

Peter, Preaching of; used by Aristides, 86 ff.; the fragments collected, 87 ff.; attempt at its reconstruction, 91, 93 f., 97 f.; used in Acts of Thomas, 91; and in Sibylline Books, 91 ff.; and in Ep. to Diognetus, 95 ff.; and possibly by Celsus, 98 f.

Philosophers, Sayings of; Syriac MS. of, 5

Plutarch; Syriac MSS. of, 4 f. Pythagoras, Syriac MS. of, 5

Quadratus; his Apology, 2; Eusebian account of, 6 ff.; whether bishop of Athens, 11 ff.

Sibylline Books; used the Preaching of Peter, 91 ff.

Syriac Version of the Apology; its discovery, 3; description of MS., 3 ff.; English translation, 35 ff.; notes on, 52 ff.; compared with Armenian fragment and with Greek, 71 ff.; its comparative faithfulness, 80, 94

Teaching of the Apostles; see Didaché Theano; Syriac MS. of, 5 Thomas, Acts of; used the Preaching of Peter, 91 Two Ways; see Didaché

Virgin Mary; the term Theotokos, 2, 3, 79; the Panthera story, 25

Wisbech; MS. of B. and J., 81

THE SYRIAC TEXT OF THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES.



مدخاله حدیا بنزی، وفسی سد لسه بنزی بنو بنوره بنوره بنوره بنوره ایماسی بزنی به بنوره بروره این بروره این بروره این بروره بروره

סו שלק: מפם: כיחשי: האישלהש: פושחפא:

ور الماد ال

مة من من خلم. حلل المحتم وقدهم و משבולא כתבתבא הבת הביא: ההבת אתא השלא ocipis Kulan efterpano 17 ciafus cinera الم وتعليه دبر دمتم مقعير معززم عبح مدم حتديمهم مرين مولين بموسم . محلك سبه دير בדבון לבנחממה הממפשון מנחה ב לבנון המשובדין 10 LENG .. addition in and strong . and المنفرزم حر مدرهم مسلميس حمزمر بالمهم איש הנלחכם בן לציחלמים. כא הין הלהבי חלב עד מנחחם. בלבעד בן בושלעה: בן שחבונה معدية المن ويدون المراسم ود محدة المرام وا دعمدحملم صلم صجة في مخدم لحص محتفدمم له ساخته مداع داله در المدرد مداع مدا مدر الم מוכוא פוניא: בו לעוצב מחוא חניים או directions exists resolutions المعام ال مديم ديمل حل تهوين ديمزحي د دخلامهم حديد Limos rachy of who ozen legatura.

ı. Cod سعماقت.

مخلعہ لین محفظم ورسمه ورستان عمر خم ونعم ورساء المعسمة والمحلم مديم عمقد بالمهم ومعدمه بالمام المام الما الم معمقةسم عم تخلعه معمدها العملسم. בשחבה אלוא הפהו בנותה : משר ביות ביות מוצ מוצ מוד حسم . الحفود لم حداده منزني در دنادسم تخدس من وهدر فوه ل دم وحدومه مهدر letenber : et moermo visimo reinfus. عنتمل ليز. وزد ملحمه مالعسم : لخر وزد ٥١ دين ده مدين محل ده . معني مدهم مدمهم בבא מנאי סבולסף ארשיקא אים כשי מכם لاحدا دافتسهم . موته دسم . مصم الاعدسم אולם בי ולם בין ופצו שלי אפשל: אם איף שנאלים سلم بمجنه. مرح مرد دام دقاه دقاه در المنهم الملم في المحدد من المحدد من المحدد لخسمه عنزنه: لملم وزدم ده مددم لعلمه وعلمد who is expense. Its aft basedons rejusting مندى حديد فله: عدد دم وحدده بلحم مخراص. دد حنادع بالم مدم مقلم دعادم، مه خم ويديم . _ مير بخدي مسلم به الماء مريد مريد مريد אים הכשבחבא. בלל הלא שבין הנהבחנות לבודא. ممع ماتمب سدم محصوص سد لسد منطب حددم المادي بدايم بديم محدول مل وعدد كرون على

شده دومید و بدوسه و بدوس با به منده مده مده مده مده مده و بدوسه و بدوسه و بدوس با به بدوس با با بدوس با بدوس

^{23.} Cod. .ml.

حديمي ووسح المو حديم المو و الدياء دوسو حلمتن. مقسم ، قدم مه مخلع مه دهمالم. مقدمهم متم مرحةسم معمدةم مر مل المراعة الما المراه المراع المراه المراع المراه المراع المراه ال مه دندی کے مل لسد سد مدسهم و مدسوم ישטיועליי נבטח דלא בדילפיים שטניו שישונים مصاها . كامع ماء مصا بنه منه مهم محمه مامعدهام مراعب محلف محدده محددهم ٥١ حشادم. ١٥ للمله له عدسه مهدسهم. ماديم حسّديم. محم مةحلم لم خويم سنقس. ملمحم خميم. حر خر ددخه له حملنه. مخر دميل له حم حسومحاء .حموس حاء عض سا مساء فساء الناب لدهدة بهم فحلم له. مندم ده مهم רבים מובאלוואר הכלם בין דעה כן معقدسهم عنه مر علمه و مندم لم عل سد مرسم: مه سلم نود اعده المه مم عمر ידיני בושחד אים ארד בלך ברוש ביבים בעשוצי צחצי 02 टिका मंद्रम राष्ट्रयामिक. तम् संद्रयम राप्तेदांव قيما رس مه مرم دس مدن وده درم درم درم ويتنبى والمات الم الم الم الموادي الما الموام الموام المام ا سهسعه ما من الماء مهم المعقد معلم مح דראכים בושובשי בשמונים בישולים בישונים ביושינים אים ביושינים ביושי

حنور دم هم هن بحده هم مدده مطهوره مده والله دم مدون مداه والله دم مدون والله دم ومواد الماله وم مداه والله وم ومواد الماله وم مده والله وم ومواد الماله وم ومواد الماله ومواد ومواد الماله ومواد الماله

ديم عن من بدام د مرون مد ديمون مخدر אשבענסשר לביוא. האיף האהובן כן באכנושם. صلع عدد مله لعزنه ولدحمه سلممله، ملوز حرور שונא הצוכא. נהצין ביו. הכתובנון כח כאלחאי בבחוא הצובוא ההאובאי מה הבל כש הבל וכומי: מה הנוש למ עבוד אומא אעונה. מה המבוף מנוח ومقديم سلم دحل لمزحمهم وعجد مده على على ما الباتيم لصم عل صونه معمده العلم العامد. و١٥ הכלולה החדאי לא בינים חלא ובונים. חלא משחהם صصوره و الملاء مله ونحم عل المعلام مله المعربة المعرب المحمد ملمحم محمدة ملعملم معتدم لصم حلمندم. محم مضمم شديم حدمهم متدبع ملعمدته مدخلع دزيد ملم معريه. ٥٥ محدم دلم بردم دندده لصه عستنم المدب لم فعذم محر محددلله ووديم وولمديم تعطير. وقيم لعن ممل ممام و ملكم و و المرابع ال

^{1.} Cod. .~ h. du.

حتاب بحموتهم : حقلم مانفسهم : دخده حدز مرده مرد منابع القديم مفروم مانده مفروم مردوم درام مردوم مردوم

معتمل المتدهم المتدهم الاستولى المعتمل المعتم

 معلقة ويسم تحجلي مهدني بديد بدلمه بدلسه ملاسم كالشيم كي مدوره الله مهدني بدي المحمود المالية المحتاج المحتاء المحتاج المحتاج المحتاج المحتاج المحتاج المحتاء المحتاء المحتاء

ماع كنة دو هده بوري دري الما معه عن نب همه المان معمد المان معمد المان معمد المان معمد المان معمد المان الما

^{22.} Cod. 1280x.

אפיש ואובא. ההמכוא הן אשלים אם כבוא. בל مةساء: وحد معاوم مع عودم وحلهم حددما: دسةوديس وحدليله فس عديم لحده دله و مامدة به مدين ماليك ولا مدين مد ندر لملقسم وحر عدموسم حملعانم محعموم: مخد مدمولين محدفهمميم محدم متران ملط الحم المم معلمالهم محد خطميم محر بالمنامكم دادی حدهدم مدد حدد سفده مدد حددمهممبر سددی المسالم حمسمام براء جمساء ماء فصد برا عه ١٥ השבא ייה בשער אן בשבשוז גופוטשו אירושים مر حالا دوند معدسم معدم دفده مهمهم صتمح معلقه و در المن محله علام מושאל בשב אדמ שבן המל בבהן בשומה مساها مسيد دل. محد بأحير دخير ديدهم مسلم اع صه وحدمهم عدد الم سرسد والخر ومعدم مص دعدسه دسامهد. محصلم حدلم علد مالمهملي. مهم صه درينهم عصيم بهدين دين ديمد دمرين ومودر ودشوع و المراج المراج والمراج و المراج و ا معممد محسون مل بع مسلم ملاية معدد 20 סתן שלין מוק לא משכבא לשי מיניבא שנ הלבין כני אנבא כמלין המלעוצבין. שנממומה הין

^{10.} Cod. 12800.

^{22.} Cod. amisachisa pit amin't.

Alma aft susme. oxhoft of ci susme one albom. cils exem ricit herm: oseers on one rherm to cari subone shows

حبة معدد: حلل دشدملي حب عندم وحديدين الم موف المات سام ماديم سام ماديم dul krai saulas khai Le ak Klk : Kälk בחן: שיבן בובא ואלמא. אנא בי הנוחם فردم لعندي سيتديم وم لعيليم. محدمهم لسنة. ممستديم لعالمة. محسم لممتدلمن ملحبعه ملعمد، ملتبه ملحمة مادمة ماديني ما הומו הנוחם בעדין לביחודה האנידא נוחות erofy. Remo Leter. Remo Lion. محديه لمعوده ممستنم لمنه. ممستنم للممحم ملحةلي ملحقحه. معسودي لدجوني ملعنديم ديمي هلم ملم في العم دولم ود صلم دله حدم من دد دلدم ستم دخالسسه المراب مهدور مر دند مدم مد مر دية المسم و مديمه عدد مديمه وحد بخيام محمحهم مسمم ادلی، ملی محصفحلم مخدم *... « «سالته «سالته

حماله مع بدا مدال دوسع مسددة با مداده عدید دیمره حل بادی: شده صلم مهن محم cles fer: la pri acap long rulhans الاست مه ماید داد . دست م د د در دست وديسهم و محدده علمه مراده المراد المر مهو هر زسته دهیموس صحیح محتین محلم ניבר אואר במושא מושאר המאם באניי חובים. anducia cela suapha afreaba. esi es elma حددم دمل مل مزمم در مدمر لمية فلسر همه ٥١ لمعهد متحدم ومالسمه لع مدين ومد ومد لنه لع دحلم مصنون مسهف. دو وبر لع مهوبلا אשונט וכן ליפונש אינוחורי. בומף אשש בת אום حزن لحيدًام وحيمه مديه مدم احدي مديد eren rich cim. onbede eg frerou era nafla. ور مسدم لع مسع ويله محمد معم معمد عم مهمة cim: محنيه مدمل لغليم بهديون حدايه. ملحمله Komlk ook ham _K . dam kit dukisis main: of neur phiesi Chair nuon ocalm. مديم تحديم المسائل المذار. هذا الم تحديد ٥٥ دهانم هنا مدنوه عدن مدني من المام ديم ١٥٥ דין לא שלב דיםאי

محلمهد دم دیمون محنی، دیمله میموهدد درمادی میموند درخین میمودد: درخین میمودد: درخین درخین

THE STAND OF THE PORTY OF STAND CHANGE OF STANDS CHANGE OF STANDS CHANGE CHANGE

ور المحارك ا

^{5.} Cod. .๙๙im. 6. Cod. ඣ.

مرسام: شد «محدنه «سالم دلسم بعددسم»

ده مادام کردن مراهاد می در الماد می در الماد می در الماد می مردن می در الماد می در الماد

مهمهد لع نوده مرسانه جنه مهدنم دهه هده مهمولا هر هده همه دسانه جنه مله معدد دنده

^{13.} Cod. 2207K.

مد مدها مرسام مساحه مداع من مدنی مدر مدنی مدر مدنی مدرنای مدرنای مدرنای مدرنای مدرنای مدرنای مدرنای مدرنای مدر

شاملی مورد دران، ویدن مورد دی استان ایمان ایمان استان مورد در استان ایمان استان ایمان استان ایمان استان ایمان استان ایمان ا

محر دهز هدی هجلم به بست به معزی اه معلم در معزم در معلم معرفی در معرفی معلم معرفی در معرفی در معرفی در معرفی معرفی در معرفی به د

^{4.} Cod. Khasi.

مهمد شحلم مسانه مفنم له مانه. مهدنم دملههد عاداله ملنه مانه دخمه متحده دلم دله، معدم عسم حدد اسه. هدم متحده دلم دله، معدم عسم حدد اسه. هدم ده دمونم دلساله کنن حمداده دمانه دمانه دمونمدیک. بلک دمانه ماده، محمله محمله محداده دمونمدیک.

κὶσς seems to be a mistake for καις. The Greek has κλέπτην.

^{11.} Cod. warinzafi.

نام، ومر موزوها، مستولی و موزود و موزود و الماده و الما

مورد براسه سربانه سومور مهدنا والمدالة والمدالة المراسة المراسة والمراسة و

ممامد تخطي ملسم مستدين. مفتع لم ستحسف.

^{1.} Ειαππίοα, a corrupt form. The Greek has καὶ Ῥαδάμανθυν.

^{3.} wantally for wat nately.

الحظون مرام المانه من المانه من المانه الما

^{3.} Cod. Kr.j. 14. Cod. Kjmon monnui.

^{17.} For Kinalk we should read Kinalk or Kinalk.

^{19.} For Kalka we should read Kalka.

^{20.} ωαωσίνη seems to be a corruption of ωιαωσίνη (Μνη-μοσύνης).

مربح مخدم دفحه دتد مدیم خلام مهم المرب مانده مناسه مناسه مانده مناسه مانده و المرب و ا

ساله محدل على معدمه والمهم والمهم والمهمة والمعمد والمهمة وا

^{9.} Cod. പ്രത് പ്രതിച.

مسفحيم عمام وكالم معامد مسفحم مذكرم محملسحمي مفللم لمحشيس مرندبم مناوير. محديهم محدة بر وسلية مناسعه مهمه. מעומם שב אנא במושם הציא בים. מעושם و حصلة بم بعده محدسه علمة محلقه على مهمه. محسم حدل حداه محسم حد دوعه ملاهسه. محدسهم عد لقد مريم معنام حديم. محدسه وحزمم غيبه محسم حدد قد معدم مر المرابعة مع معدونم محرفته مر ود סו אנא . הענתה אמין לציטך וחים י עבועוס خلمتراجم ممادر معربهم ليحمله دشمهم معلمالمه: مه وزيرة مرم ديد معلماله סמומם בתנובבא הבה הבה אך לינים ממומם בשליים במשלמשלם במשלמשאל אבו בישאל دعد من مد مرا مراه مروزي. وحمر فره مروزير مروزير مروزير المروزير مروزير נוֹם: האלבוה מנומן נושא מוק ואב מה خدمهم مه مط حدمم محزم وحل عدوه ملاسانس معدم قد مربع جلم فرس المعدم سعدل مراسم و المالم مح در المالم و المالم ال مع مع المسام معل العلم الما المام ا במשלטה הלו שלם המשלה סבים במשלטה הנוש

(10)

^{1.} For esta we should probably read esta-

^{17.} For Kiasız we should probably read Kisaz.

^{18.} Cod. .a....

TENDER SERVICE OR TO SERVICE SOLVE SERVICE SOLVE OR CLE OR SERVICE SOLVE SOLVE SOLVE SERVICE SOLVE SOL

محدی یم خلدی ادف لم دسافط لمحده می دوندنی دوشد دلی حصده ملی کارنی به عندی عندی به دوندنی عندی میدانی دو در می میدانی ده دوندی میدانی در میدانی میدانی در میدانی میدانی در میدانی میدانی در میدانی میدا

^{6.} Cod. .. max. 21.

^{13.} Cod. : مما مالد حملية.

در الم مرسم حدده دراك دوره دراك در المراك دراك دوره مرسم الموره دراك دوره مرسم الموره دراك دوره مرسم الموره المرسم المرس

^{20.} Cod. - Read - 0017217?

مله معملاه. مله مطلعة. حد مره لط ندم مماهم

^{15.} Cod. **ad. i.s.**

Day of the expersion of the elaboration of the elab

سفوم حدا نه خام حاسم براهمی دراهمی محمده درسمی درسمی

^{9.} Cod. معتمهرع.

رور الماسم سول هعجم نوسي والحلمة من الماسم الماسم

مقدم معتدم محتصليم

دینک شویل هی دودنی، دهمیک دیدی دیمی کامی بادی دیدی در کیدی در کیمیلی در کردی مربی کسور عزنی و حل کاری در مالی مربی در مالی در

و مراع مرفال ، برمانه و مراع من مربال ۱۹۵۸ و مربال ۱۹۵۸

منامه محل سندم الم المعالم المالم المالم

ישה האם הים עיבר ליד לושמם. בל אבים אבים בחודה האם לה לאמעת המנה את לה בתחב. המה בו מחלה את הלה לה בתחב המה בה את המנה את המנה את המנה את המנה את המנה את המנה ביל את המנה ב

בהת שמה Cod. בהת מה בהת

محافظ من المعلم المرابع المرابع المرابع المرابع المرابع المربع المرابع المربع المرابع المربع المربع

المنا منا معمله مسلمة به مدم غنهم حديد منع محديم والم عدود مولم عدام. مريب و حدمه، فعمله مام حدمة ونه. معمله وم האכיול מהא מיי. דלום כמ בשינים לא. מלא שעם عد حدم. علمدم دم علمه فسه. مدمجنه השומב הל שבים מני מבו בל בשמשהרה مع عملمه شمه له، مضم ديملم له عملمه 01 معلوندی عمله مد عدی لده اس مل لیز مدرم האם שבא. בעלה אתלים בביתלאי ובשא שלאי لله له. مهد له زمده دشده. فريد دهده فديم. دوله مدمه و القالم. لم ودنم مدمه مدر معلم سجمه. عديم لم شعوب له. مام عديم ور مدل ودولورا مولا مدلم معلم دم معفودم والمداع ليله له. لم لية مدل مديد وسالم مديه. سحوم من الم الم فيم. ليه لية حدم وحدد ونفهم landon: face archierings his ceres. cla sis حدله مديدهم بسممير مضمور ساءء حم مملم وحدة مرم حدم لم عندل حل دقع وم حدم عيالم ٠٠

دملد مصر ديمويند وه حدم حد ماسه:

^{22.} رقع Cod. عم.

Roc Rea cious recr sintro errocs.

The writing Res of the sums of the sum of the sum of the sum of the columns.

The writing sintro sintro erroces of the sum of the columns.

MEN. DER MAGENA CERCAN. DENKEN.

OUTH PREEN DERICH CERCIN. NORKETH COLCING

RELEXA. WRITCH ENDERN. NORKETH COLCING

RELEXA. WRITCH COMO CLECAN. TECH.

LED L'ARTHUR COMO CLECAN. TECH.

COMO ARMANAGON. RECAN COMO O CIM CEMO.

DERICH COLONG. RECHCE COMO O CIM CEMO.

OUTHER WOLLOW THE COMO OF TECHNO.

OUTHER WOLLOW THE COMO OF TECHNO.

OUTHER WOLLOW THE COMO OF TECHNO.

TO AND THE COLONG TECHNO.

TO AND THE COLONG TECHNO.

THE

^{2.} A 3 seems to have been deleted before 1.



معمد حدومد. مناصلت معاصده

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. & SONS,

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.



HAVERFORD COLLEGE STUDIES

Published by the Faculty of

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

A Study of Codex Bezae. J. Rendel Harris.

1

To obtain copies of this publication address the Secretary of Haverford College, Haverford College P. O., Pa.

This number has been republished from the Cambridge Series of "Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristric Literature," by permission of the Editor of the Series and with the consent of the Syndies of the University Press.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY NOTES ON THE CODEX BEZAE.

It may be assumed that the search after the primitive form of the books of the New Testament, and in particular of the four Gospels, will demand the service of many minds, that have undergone very diverse forms of training. There must be a wide acquaintance with languages, if we are to understand the bearing of the Versions upon the restoration of the text, and give their evidence the right weight; there must be a keen Semitic feeling which is able to distinguish the Syriasm imported by a translator from that which belongs to the primitive apostolic idiom, or to restore the latter against editorial refinement; there must be a close study of the palaeography of the scripts which are involved in the problem; and this study must further be balanced by an acquaintance with the laws of phonetic change, so that we may not refer rare forms, when we meet with them, to mere accident or to the negligence of scribes. And in the grouping of the evidence and the estimation of the relative value of the possible solutions of the problem, a quick imagination must be side by side with a subtle reasoning power on the judgment-seat. It is too much to expect that all of these forms of fitness for critical work should be found in one person or in one school: each of the great New Testament scholars has his weak side; every successive school persists in neglecting some part or other of the evidence: and yet in spite of the slow steps by which the Textual Criticism of the New Testament is advancing, we are satisfied that it will not be long before resolute and patient labour will pluck the heart out of some of the mysteries which characterize the subject: the fields being white to the harvest, we may congratulate ourselves that the reapers are also ripening.

The object of this tract is to supply the workers with some fresh suggestions as to the handling of the central problem of the criticism of the New Testament, viz. the origin and meaning of the so-called Western Text. It is recognized that the earliest Eastern and Western witnesses to which we have access are characterized by a family likeness in their evidence: the Old Latin and the Old Syriac Versions of the Gospels bear witness to the diffusion of such a type of text in early times as we find in the Greek of the Codex Bezae: but all speculation as to the origin of this eccentric text has hitherto been unfruitful; we have run up against a dead wall, and to all appearance the wall is a pretty thick one. No one knows how this Western text came into being: we can indeed see it gradually corrected out of existence, or absorbed into revised texts both in the East and West; but its genesis is an enigma. It is clearly not altogether apostolic, for the interpolations which it contains resist such an inference; yet we cannot prove that it is unapostolic, for its antiquity is indisputable. Nor has the problem been rendered much easier by the recovery of the literature connected with the Tatian harmony: we may be sure that Tatian's text was Western, but whether it was Western in cause or effect, or both in cause and effect, is still unknown.

Now, in order to make the investigation a little easier, I propose to attack the question just at the hardest point: to make a new examination of the Western text in its leading monument, the great Cambridge manuscript, known as Codex Bezae, and to challenge it once again to tell its history.

The Codex Bezae in the Sixteenth Century.

It is well known that there have been very diverse opinions as to the origin of the MS. itself, to say nothing as to the origin of the text. Kipling, who edited the text so excellently for his day, was of opinion that the MS. had an Egyptian origin: in this belief he was followed by Schulz, who emphasised the same view in a valuable little dissertation on the subject. On the other hand, the moderns usually follow Scholz and Scrivener in the

opinion that the Ms. is of Gallican origin, the Greek text being occasionally affected by Latin forms¹, and the Latin translation being vitiated by all sorts of decaying modes of speech, which intimate that the scribe was writing in the provinces, probably to the west of the Alps, and at a time when the Latin speech was breaking up. So that it is generally held that the Codex Bezae was written in the Rhône Valley, probably at Lyons where, according to Beza, it was found; and that it never was out of France (unless it be for a possible visit to the Council of Trent. whither it is said to have been carried by a French bishop) until it was presented by Beza to the University of Cambridge in the year A.D. 1581. And while the reasons for these conclusions are not perfectly decisive, they are cumulative and in the main convincing. Accordingly I shall not repeat in detail the arguments, which may be found in Scrivener's edition of the MS. or in any good textual handbook: our task lies in another direction. I am willing to grant the hypothesis of the Gallican origin of Codex Bezae as a basis upon which to build: if the foundation be a rotten one, the edifice will soon betray the fact. It may be further admitted that the Ms. which Beza presented to the University of Cambridge is the same as the Ms. which is quoted in the margin of Robert Stephen's New Testament of A.D. 1550 under the sign β , and which Stephen affirms to have been collated by certain of his friends in Italy: and it is possible that this identification may lead to the further admission, to which allusion was made above, that the Codex Bezae was carried to the Council of Trent in 1546 by William à Prato the bishop of Clermont in the Auvergne. But this point must be reserved for a closer examination. It is sufficient here to say that such a supposition at once explains the difficulty as to how a Lyons Ms. could be collated in Italy.

But, while making these preliminary admissions, I do not admit that Beza ever recognized his own Ms. in the β of Stephen; nor again, as Gregory² following Scrivener³ asserts, that Beza had

¹ Such as $\lambda \epsilon \pi \rho \omega \sigma \sigma s$, $\phi \lambda \alpha \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha s$ and the like, which might be expected from a Latin scribe writing a bilingual copy.

² Prolegg. in Tischendorf, pp. 213, 214.

³ Codex Bezae, p. ix, note 3.

access to the collations of Henry Stephen. This last idea is a misunderstanding based on the prefaces of Beza's New Testament, which speak of a collation by Henry Stephen of all the good editions and of 25 Mss. But an examination of the annotations of Beza in his edition of 1598 will shew the following points: (1) that Beza quotes the sixteen authorities of Stephen from the margin of the edition of 1550, and treats them as sixteen Mss., although one of the authorities (α) is the Complutensian polyglott: (2) he numbers the authorities which he quotes as Stephen had numbered them; (3) he quotes the Codex Bezae and the β of Stephen as two distinct authorities: (4) the only other authorities which he uses are the Codex Claromontanus, and another Ms. which had recently come into his possession. To establish these points it is only necessary to give a few instances. If we take the annotations to the 14th chapter of Matthew, we have

v. 2. Iste, Οὖτος. In secundo codice scriptum erat, μήτι οὖτος, id est, Num iste?

Baptista, ὁ Βαπτίστης. Veteres duo codices additum habent, ὁν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα, id est, quem ego decollaui.

Here a reference to the margin of Stephen shews

μήτι. β. $\delta \nu$ έγω ἀπεκεφάλισα. β. δ.

v. 12. Corpus, $\sigma\hat{\omega}\mu a$. Quoddam exemplar legit $\pi\tau\hat{\omega}\mu a$, id est cadauer, sicut etiam loquitur Marcus 6, 29. Praeterea in quibusdam codicibus additur relatiuum $a\hat{v}\tau\hat{\omega}$.

Here Stephen notes

πτώμα. η. αὐτοῦ, θ. ιδ΄.

v. 19. Et acceptis, καὶ λαβών. Particula καὶ non erat in vetustis codic. neque reperitur in Vulgata versione.

Where Stephen notes against the kal

 $\stackrel{\sim}{\epsilon} \nu \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \ (\stackrel{\sim}{\sim} = \text{deest}).$

v. 22. Praeire sibi, προάγειν αὐτόν... In quibusdam codicibus deest αὐτόν. Rursus in aliis legitur προάγειν sed mendosé.

Here there is no note in Stephen; quibusdam codicibus stands either for quodam codice, viz. the Codex Bezae: or for the Codex Bezae together with some other unknown copy. προάγειν (2°)

must be meant either for $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\acute{a}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$, which I cannot find the authority for, or for $\pi\rho\sigma\acute{a}\gamma\iota\nu$, which is the spelling in Cod. Bezae. But as the itacism would surely not have been noticed, it is probably the former. The note is very confused.

v. 34. Gennesaret, Γεννησαρέτ. In duobus exemplaribus legimus Γεννησαρά, Gennesara. In alio quodam, Γενησαρέθ, Genesareth.

Compare with this Stephen's margin

γεννησαρά. β. γεννησαρέθ. γ.

It will be seen that the Codex Bezae appears in Beza as duo exemplaria, viz. D and β .

In the same way the famous interpolation concerning the man working on the Sabbath Day (Luke vi. 4) is referred to by Beza as found

in quodam exemplari et meo vetustissimo.

When Beza comes to the interpolation in John vi. 56, he does not notice that the passage is in his own beloved *vetustissimus*, but, seeing it quoted on the margin of Stephen as from β , he makes the following disgraceful note:

v. 53... Caeterum in uno codice vetusto mirum hîc quiddam deprehendimus. Nam post ἐν ἐαντοῖς, qui est finis versiculi 53, adscripta haec erant,... Haec ego sicut temere non expunxerim, ac praesertim priorem partem, quae totidem verbis alibi repetitur; ita non facile admiserim, quum in uno illo exemplari sint a nobis reperta. Certe alteram partem suppositam esse suspicor, quia simile nihil alibi invenio. Neque enim usquam fit mentio sumendi corporis, praeterito sanguine; et exemplar illud, unde haec desumpsimus, fuerat in Italia collatum, ubi facile fuit aliquid subiicere in Bohemorum (id est Evangelii) odium.

Similar distinction between Stephen's β and Cod. D may be seen in the case of the interpolations in Acts vi. 10 (in meo vetustissimo et alio praeterea manuscripto); in xvi. 35, which is quoted only from Stephen; and in xvi. 40, where Beza adds to Stephen's testimony the words, et in meo vet. exemplari. How closely his apparatus is identified with Stephen's may be seen in many cases: e.g. John xiii. 2, where Stephen merely says

γινομένου. β.

which Beza gives as

in vetustis codicibus omnibus, uno duntaxat excepto.

The foregoing specimens are sufficient to shew the accuracy of Hug's statements (*Introduction*, § lviii.), who shews reasons to believe that Beza's apparatus coincides closely with that of Stephen.

In fact Hug shews that, when in the first Bezan edition (A.D. 1565) we find that Beza used a collation of 25 Mss. (more or less) from the library of Stephen, we are to correct 25 to 15 (xv. for xxv.), and understand by this the apparatus on the margin of Stephen, with a possible deduction for the use of the Complutensian polyglott. In the second edition we have (A.D. 1576) seventeen MSS.; and this means the fifteen (or sixteen) of Stephen, plus either the Cod. Bezae or the Claromontanus or both. In the fourth edition, Beza has nineteen authorities, viz, the sixteen of Stephen, the Cod. Bezae, the Cod. Claromontanus, and another MS., which he says had recently come into his possession (e.g. in Matt. xxviii, 20 we have the note "caeterum in vetustissimo manuscr. codice, quem nuper sum nactus, sic ista scripta inueni" etc.). It will be seen that it is very doubtful whether we ought to take literally the statement that Beza handled the actual collations of Henry Stephen; these fifteen or sixteen collations could not have been contained in a single book, except in a printed book. And this means that if Beza handled anything, it was Stephen's text of A.D. 1550, with possibly a few additional notes. Hug is probably right in saying that "Stephanus scattered the various readings in his margin for that one, among his purchasers, who, at a future time, might desire to make use of them. This was Theodore Beza, a pupil of John Calvin, who appropriated the Scriptural collations, for which Robert was indebted to his son Henry."

And now let us go back from the time of Beza and Stephen towards the earlier history of our codex, and in particular to the sixth century when the Ms. is supposed to have been written, and examine it with a view to detecting local peculiarities.

CHAPTER II.

THE LOCALITY OF THE CODEX BEZAE IN THE TENTH CENTURY.

As we ascend the stream of time we may take note of the marginal annotations which have been made in our Ms. by different hands; and in particular there is a series of sentences in the margins of the text which would seem to intimate that the Ms. was still in France in the tenth century. In order to explain this, I shall be obliged to refer to, and partly to reproduce, some notes which I made two or three years ago on the famous S. Germain Codex of the Latin Bible, known to New Testament students by the sign g^1 , and published by Dr John Wordsworth in the first number of his Old Latin Biblical Texts.

Shortly after the publication of this text, this work was reviewed by M. Samuel Berger in the Bulletin Critique for 15 Sept. 1884, who remarked inter alia as follows: "L'Evangile de S. Jean est partagé dans le manuscrit en 316 sections, et 185 de ces paragraphes (si j'ai bien compté) sont accompagnés de courtes devises, sans aucune relation avec le texte de l'Evangile, écrites en un latin barbare, et dont voici, par exemple, quelques-unes. xxx. (c. iii. 1) Perfectum opus. xxxi. (iii. 3) Insperata causa perficitur. xxxii. (iii. 7) Quod verum est dicito. xxxiii. (iii. 9) Si mentiris arguent te. xxxiv. (iii. 12) Gloria magna. xxxv. (iii. 14) Pro manifestatione. xxxvi. (iii. 16) De juditio quod verum est si dixeris, libens eris. xxxviii. (iii. 19) Ad peregrinationem itineris venies. Il n'est pas possible de voir dans ces singulières notes autre chose que des formules de bonne aventure, de celle que l'on a appelées sortes sanctorum."

¹ The Sortes Sanctorum in the S. Germain Codex, American Journal of Philology, Vol. 1x., p. 58,

There is not the slightest doubt that M. Berger's explanation of these marginal sentences (which had been copied for Dr Wordsworth by Mr G. L. Youngman, but not understood by him) is correct. The book has been used for purposes of divination, a custom which seems to have prevailed widely in early times both in Civil and Ecclesiastical matters¹.

Without going into the matter in detail it will be sufficient to observe that the most probable method of using the Sortes would be by the selection of a number, for there are objections to the method of opening the book at random where the margins are thickly studded with sentences. Probably therefore a number was selected and the pages of the Gospel of John were turned until the sentence was found to which that number was attached.

By the kindness of Dr Wordsworth and the courteous assistance of one of the students in the Theological College at Salisbury, I have been furnished with a transcript of Mr Youngman's notes on these Sortes, and am enabled to draw one or two further conclusions. The transcript shews the successive sentences arranged with the attached numerals in a series running with frequent chasms from i. to ccxvi. (read cccxvi.). In a few cases the numeral is wanting, and there are occasionally slight clerical errors like the one just mentioned, which are capable of immediate rectification. We will examine the series of sentences more closely presently. Meanwhile let us turn to another peculiar feature of the Codex which has hitherto remained without explanation.

On fol. 89 b the following note is made by Dr Wordsworth (p. x.): "At the end of the letter to Damasus is a sort of wheel full of numbers, apparently some arrangement of the Canons which follow on $4\frac{1}{2}$ pages." My attention was drawn to this wheel by Dr Wordsworth, with an enquiry whether any explanation could be given of it. In order to settle this point, I made a copy of the series of numbers in question. They are arranged in the separate compartments of a wheel with eight sectors; and a little examination shews that they have nothing to do, as far as can be seen by a cursory examination, with the Eusebian Canons; but,

¹ Prof. Robertson Smith has pointed out to me a curious analogous case of divination by opening the Koran at random, as practised by Walid. b. Yazīd who died A.H. 126. Cf. Ibn Athir (ed. Tornberg), v. 219.

observing that the numbers form a broken series from 1 to 316, we easily infer that the wheel is a part of the Sortes Sanctorum and that in some way or other its compartments are meant to be employed in the problem of determining one's destiny. So much is certain. We may not be able to say according to what method a number was selected from one of the eight compartments, but the relation between the wheel of numbers and the sections in St John's Gospel is certain. When we come to examine the numbered compartments more carefully in comparison with the numbered sentences, we find that in the majority of cases a number in one of the compartments corresponds to a number in the margins to which a sentence is attached, as of course it should do on the hypothesis of identity between the two series; but there are many cases in which the two series will not agree, and the suggestion arises in one's mind that perhaps the wheel of numbers was not made directly from the Codex, but that both it and the series may be derived from some earlier and more complete series. This supposition would easily explain the incomplete character of the numerical assonances; for example, in the first compartment of the wheel there are 33 numbers, of which 11 do not find a place in the numbers of the Sortes. We shall examine these and see whether the suspicion of an earlier set of divination sentences is confirmed in other directions.

Let us then turn to the Codex Bezae, where we shall find that the lower margins of the Gospel of St Mark contain, in a rude Greek hand, a succession of short sentences.

Of these Scrivener says (p. xxxvii.), "They consist of moral apophthegms, some of them silly enough." Amongst his facsimiles he gives a sentence from the margin of the verso of leaf 302:

εαν ψυση ελεγχουσιν σε

and conjectures that these rude uncials may be due to the hand that wrote the $\tau i \tau \lambda o \iota$ in Matthew and Mark, i.e. to a hand of the tenth century. Again, at the end of the book, he makes a collection of the sentences, 69 in number, but without noticing that they are a system of "Sortes Sanctorum."

When we examine these Greek Sortes by the side of the Latin system in the S. Germain Ms. we easily see that they form a part of the same system. For example, the sentence quoted above is evidently the same as appears in g^1 , under the form "si mentiris, arguent te"; and this is only one out of a large number of coincidences so complete that we may be certain some connection exists between the two systems. Moreover the list in D may be seen to be a translation from the Latin, by a frequently prefixed word $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\mu\eta\nu\epsilon\dot{\iota}a$: as if the sentences had originally stood in two languages in some bilingual codex.

In order to determine the nature of the relationship between our two series we must examine more closely, and we may easily assure ourselves in the first place that neither catalogue was taken from the other, for each list of sentences contains many things that are wanting in the other. But in the next place, if the two sets of sentences be arranged side by side, we can easily see that if a number be attached to each of the sentences in Codex Bezae corresponding to its place in the Codex, the sentences thus numbered will be in harmony with the actually numbered passages in the S. Germain Codex. In order to make this clear we may actually write down the first portions of each of the two catalogues as follows, the S. Germain list being given completely and the parallel sentences noted from the other list:

S. Germain Cod.

- (i) cessa ei certaueris.
- (ii) qd fit coplebitū.
- (iii) non ad ipsis causa.
- (iv) perficitur causa.
- (? xiii) spes bona.
- gaudium fiet.
 (xv) est decē dies fiet.
- (xviii) et bene.

(xxii) perfectū opus.

(xxii, l. xxiv) credere quia causa bona ē. *

etc.

Codex Bezae.

- (i) αφες μι φιλονικησις.
- (ii) το γενωμενον τελίουτε.
- (iii) ουκ επίτυχανίς του παργμάτος.
- (iv) τελιουμενον παραμα.

(xiv) απο λυπϊς ης χαραν.

- (xv) μετα δεκα ημερας γϊνετε.
- (xviii) ακολουθησον καϊ καλον ου γι-
- (χχίι) τεληουμενον παργμα καλον.
- (xxiv) πιστευσον οτη το παργμα καλον εστιν.

etc.

The barbarisms are easily corrected in the foregoing: *ad ipsis*, for example = *adipisceris*, and so on. These corrections being made, it is seen that, as far as it goes, the list in Codex Bezae is complete, though only a fragment of the original scheme; and

that the list in the S. Germain MS. is a series of extracts from the original scheme.

The agreement between the numbers shews that the Beza sentences and the S. Germain sentences are taken from a numbered series of sentences similar to that in the S. Germain Codex, i.e. the numbers are not due to the sectional arrangement of St John in the S. Germain Codex into 316 paragraphs, but to a similar arrangement in a previous Codex. And since the S. Germain Codex has these paragraph divisions also in common with the original from which the Sortes were taken, it follows that this original may very well have been, at least in St John, the Ms. from which the S. Germain Codex took the foundation of its text. We thus throw into very close relation the Codex Bezae, the S. Germain Codex, and the archetype of the latter in St John.

Moreover, the two series of annotations belong nearly to the same period of time; the S. Germain Ms. being of the ninth century, and the Bezan annotator being referred by Scrivener to the tenth. And since the two Codices in question are both found in modern times in French abbeys, we may perhaps be allowed to assume that the Codex Bezae was in France in the tenth century.

CHAPTER III.

THE CODEX BEZAE IN THE NINTH CENTURY.

On fol. 150 b of the Ms. there is a liturgical note by a hand of the ninth century, at the top of the left hand column, to the following effect

τη κυριακη των προφέτησματων

accompanied by the labarum with a and ω . This note is rather perplexing: but it seems to be a corruption for

τη κυριακη των προφωτισματων

i.e. it indicates a lesson beginning at John xii. 1 which is the top of the column, for some Sunday connected with those who have been approved as candidates for baptism, and who in the language of the Church are already $\phi\omega\tau\iota\zeta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\iota\iota$, illuminati. But what Sunday can this be, and what service can be especially given up to the imperfectly initiated Catechumens? I think the answer must be as follows: it is some Sunday before Easter when the Catechumens pass through another stage of their novitiate, and probably it will be the time of the delivery to them of the Symbol of the Faith (traditio Symboli). Now this rite took place in the Gallican Churches on Palm-Sunday, as we may see from the lectionary of Luxeuil, a thoroughly Gallican book of the seventh century, which marks the Legenda in Dominica Palmarum as follows:

Lectio Hierimiae prophetae. Epistola Pauli apostoli ad Hebraeos. Lectio Sancti Evangelii secundum Iohannem.

and

Diebus illis ante sex dies Paschae, venit Dominus Iesus Bethaniam, ubi fuerat Lazarus mortuus, etc.... usque Nisi granum frumenti cadens in

terram mortuum fuerit, ipsum solum manet: si autem mortuum fuerit, multum fructum affert:

i.e. John xii. 1—24: and that this is the lesson for the *Missa* in *Symboli traditione* may be seen from numerous references in Western writers: it was the custom for example in Milan in the days of Ambrose, as the following extract from his 20th Epistle will shew: "Sequenti die, erat autem dominica, post lectiones atque tractatum, dimissis catechuminis, symbolum aliquibus competentibus in baptisteriis tradebam basilicae." He is speaking of what happened on a certain Palm-Sunday.

The same day is fixed by Isidore for the Spanish Churches; "hoc die Symbolum competentibus traditur propter confinem Dominicae Paschae solemnitatem: ut qui iam ad Dei gratiam percipiendam festinant fidem quam confiteantur agnoscant¹."

Isidore tells us that the common name for this Sunday was Capitilavium, because, as we might almost have guessed from the lesson read, the baptized infants on this day received unction and had their heads washed, in remembrance of our Lord's visit to Bethany, and the washing and anointing of His feet by Mary.

We may add to the foregoing references the decree of the Council of Agde (A.D. 506). "Symbolum etiam placuit ab omnibus ecclesiis una die, id est ante octo dies dominicae resurrectionis, publice in ecclesia competentibus tradi."

We may be sure then that the lesson marked by the corrector, whom Scrivener calls J, is the old Gallican lesson for Palm-Sunday, as we find it in the seventh century lectionary of Luxeuil. We can hardly then allow that the Codex Bezae was far away from France in the ninth century, for by this time it is not likely that the Gallican use was still in force at Milan. And at any rate, when we put this piece of evidence side by side with what has gone before, it will be admitted that the Gallican features are becoming prominent.

It may be perhaps objected that substantially the same lesson is used in the Greek Church in the Liturgy for Palm-Sunday: but a Greek scribe would have simply called it the κυριακὴ τῶν βαίων. Moreover we do not deny the occasional agreement between the Gallican and Greek systems. We simply observe that it is not

¹ Isidore, De Offic. Eccl., c, 27.

the Roman system that we have here, and we try to interpret liturgically the Greek heading by which the day in question must have been known in the Western Calendar¹.

Almost contemporary with these liturgical annotations of the scribe J, but perhaps a few years later, there is a long series by another scribe L: there are 149 places where Scrivener notes his handiwork, and he refers all the lessons in question to the ordinary Greek synaxarion. No doubt there is a close connexion between the Greek and Gallican rituals, but the matter is by no means as simple as Scrivener represents it.

The lists of lessons introduced by L are usually given in the form $a\nu\nu a\gamma\nu o\sigma\mu a$, followed in many cases by $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ του $\sigma a\beta\beta a\tau o\nu$ or $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ του $\kappa\nu\rho\iota a\kappa\eta$. But it is very seldom indeed that any indication is given of the Sabbath or Sunday that is intended.

This of itself is an indication that the lessons were not marked in from a synaxarion, but from a more simple order like the Lectiones Dominicales in the Bobbio Sacramentary² where a series of Missae Dominicales is given with an appropriate lesson, together with the special services for *Depositio Sacerdotis*, and for the Missa Defunctorum, etc.

The scribe L had a book something like this, with a series of Saturday and Sunday Lessons unattached to any special days: he had also the lesson for the Departed, and the lessons for Holy Week and a few great festivals.

We have not, however, succeeded in identifying his system.

¹ The so-called Missale Gothicum has a special service,

Missa in Symbuli Traditione.

That this is meant for Palm Sunday may be seen by the various prayers: e.g.

Immolatio Missae.

Vere dignum et justum est.....

Tibi enim cum lingua coma servivit arborea, cum arenosa itinera ramis viruerunt composita etc.

And that the lesson read is from John xii. may be seen inter alia from the

Collectio in Pacem.

Universorum ipse dominator qui conditor, creaturae tuae praestanter amabilis et amator, cui Martha satagit, Maria pedes abluit, cum quo Lazarus redivivus accumbit etc.

² Muratori, Sacramentarium Gallicanum in Musaeo Italico, I. p. 273 sqq.

If, for instance, we look on fol. 120 b of our Ms. we find that L has noted a lesson, apparently John v. 19—24, as $[\pi]\epsilon\rho\iota$ ava π ava $\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$; this Scrivener identifies with the lesson John v. 17—24, which is given in Greek synaxaria for the fourth day of the second week after Easter. The lesson, however, is evidently meant for the Missa Defunctorum $(\tau\hat{\omega}\nu\ a\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu)$, and therefore the reference to Easter Week is meaningless.

That $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\dot{\nu}\omega$ is the right word to describe the intermediate state may be seen from Luke xvi. 23, where the scribe has expanded the passage $\kappa\alpha\iota\lambda\alpha\zeta\alpha\rho\sigma\nu$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\omega$ $\kappa\sigma\lambda\pi\omega$ $\alpha\nu\tau\sigma\sigma\nu$ by the addition of the word $\alpha\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$; cp. also Apoc. xiv. 13.

In the Bobbio Sacramentary, which is supposed to contain so much ancient Gallican matter, the lesson is not the one marked in Cod. Bezae; but the somewhat similar passage, John vi. 39, 40, is read in the *Missa Defunctorum*, and the lesson John v. 24—29 is read in connection with the *Missa Sacerdotis Defuncti*.

It seems, then, that the system of the scribe L was not unlike that of the Bobbio Ms., but cannot be identified with it.

The same thing is true when we examine the systems more closely; on fol. 87 b, for instance, the lesson Matt. xxv. 31—46 is marked by L as ανναγνοσμα περι του κυριακη: and Scrivener accordingly identifies it with the κυριακή τῆς ἀποκρέω: it is, however, marked in the Bobbio Ms. as an ordinary Dominical Lection: and if we could find a sufficient number of similar coincidences, we should say that the system of this Sacramentary was the system of the Bezan annotator. The verifications, however, are not forthcoming, and we can only say that there is reason to suspect the existence of some liturgical usage current in Eastern or Southern France which would turn out to be exactly parallel to that in the Codex Bezae. Such a system would be derived ultimately from a very early and simple form of what we now know as the Greek Synaxarion.

We do not, however, pretend to have thrown much direct light upon the nationality of the corrector whom Scrivener calls L

CHAPTER IV.

SIXTH CENTURY GALLICISMS OF CODEX BEZAE.

THOSE who have held the theory of the Gallic origin of the Codex Bezae have done so on the ground that there were words in the Latin text which belonged not merely to the Vulgar Latin as distinguished from the classical speech, but to those dialectical forms of the Vulgar Latin which were supposed to be characteristic of Southern Gaul.

For example, Scholz in the Introduction to his New Testament¹ says

"In Gallia meridionali patria codicis quaerenda est. Etiam orthographia in vocibus latinis servata v. c. temptatio, quotiens, thensaurus, anticus, locuntur, inicus, secuntur huic certe regioni magis quam alii convenit; voces soniis (gallicè soins) ($\mu\epsilon\rhoi\mu\nu\alpha$ us), refectio ($\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{\alpha}\lambda\nu\mu\alpha$), sideratos ($\kappa\nu\lambda\lambda$ oύs), involet ($\kappa\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\psi\eta$), demorari ($\delta\iota\alpha\tau\rhoi\beta\epsilon\iota\nu$), natatoria piscina ($\kappa\lambda\nu\mu\betai\theta\rho\alpha$), taediari ($\kappa\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\nu\epsilon\dot{\nu}$), applontat ($\dot{\rho}\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$), certabatur ($\delta\iota\alpha\chi\nu\rhoi\dot{\xi}\epsilon\tau$ o), sestertia ducenta ($\dot{\alpha}\rho\gamma\nu\rhoi$ ov $\mu\nu\rho\iota\dot{\alpha}\delta\alpha$ s $\pi\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\dot{\epsilon}$), *($\delta\eta\nu\dot{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu$), in aliam regionem plane non quadrant: sunt enim voces gallicae."

With this list Scholz practically dismisses the subject. It need scarcely be said that a modern student would hardly be convinced by such a list²: in fact the only word in all Scholz's array that carries much weight is the word soniis, used as an equivalent of $\mu\epsilon\rho'\mu\nu\alpha\iota\varsigma$. But even in this case (which we shall enquire into more carefully by and by) there is great difficulty in the determination of the origin of the form, and much doubt as to whether Scholz has given its true French equivalent. But leaving this on one side, and remembering that the student of

¹ p. xxxix.

² Imagine the geographical delineation of the sign * for denarius; the Diocletian edict which fixed prices throughout the whole Roman Empire uses this sign!

Latin inscriptions is constantly baffled in his work by too hasty attempts to give a local habitation to special forms and spellings, we think it best not to begin by discussing in detail every word which may be supposed to have a Gallic flavour, but to proceed in a new manner, independently of earlier investigators, so that our results may be based as far as possible upon new observations, and not derive their weight from their possible consensus with the conclusions of Kipling, or Scholz, or Scrivener.

On the hypothesis that the Codex Bezae was written in Gaul, presumably not very far from the place where Beza said it was found, i.e. at Lyons,—or if we prefer to think, from the fact that Beza in his last edition called it Claromontanus (as though he had found out in his last days that he had been misinformed as to its origin by the person who sold it to him), that it was written not far from Clermont,—we have to transport ourselves in thought to the Gaul of the sixth century at the time when the Keltic population was being hurled back by Frankish invaders, and when the earlier colonists from the Eastern shores of the Mediterranean. who had civilized the Rhône Valley, were far on the road to absorption and disintegration amongst the younger and more vigorous populations that were disputing the right to existence in Central and Southern France. Amongst these struggling populations we find an active Christian Church with a ritual and liturgy of its own, which can be distinguished in many ways from the corresponding Roman rituals, by the prevalence of many Greek and Oriental customs and formulae which never seem to have taken root in Rome itself. Whether these peculiarities be original with the Church that emigrated from Smyrna to the banks of the Rhône in the second century, or whether they are to be referred to some later influence, is not the immediate question for us. It is sufficient to say that the Gallican ritual had many Eastern features. Let us take an instance; in the Gallican Mass, after the entry of the officiating bishop and the preliminary sentences, the service proceeds with the Trisagion, the Kyrie Eleison, and the Benedictus, after which the lessons from the Scriptures begin. Now this use of the Trisagion in this connection is not a Roman custom; in fact we have in the place of it the Gloria in excelsis. But it was a custom of the early Gallic Church, for we find it enforced by the second council of Vaison (A.D. 529) in a manner which shews that it was a feature of the worship of the settlements in the Rhône Valley¹: the language of the Council is as follows:

"in omnibus missis, seu in matutinis, seu in quadrigesimalibus, seu in illis quae pro defunctorum commemoratione fiunt, semper Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus eo ordine quo modo ad missas publicas dicitur, dici debeat; quia tam sancta et tam dulcis et desiderabilis vox, etiam si die noctuque possit dici, fastidium non possit generare."

We see that the object of the Council is to make the use of the Trisagion a general feature of Christian worship.

Now let us see how the French Christians pronounced this often repeated Greek word.

A reference to the life of Saint Géry, the bishop of Cambrai in the seventh century, gives us the following, "Aius, Aius, Aius per trinum numerum imposuit in nomine Trinitatis²." It appears then that this word came to be pronounced Aius instead of Agios, which does not at all surprise us, knowing how easily the aspirates are misplaced in Low Latin, and how in French similar words wear away, as for example, Augustus passes into Août, so that the middle consonant weakens and disappears, especially when the accent is on the first syllable.

Now if we turn to the account of the Gallican ritual given by S. Germain of Paris³ at the end of the sixth century, we find the canticles at the commencement of the service described as follows:

DE AIVS.

Aius vero ante prophetiam pro hoc cantatur in graeca lingua.... Incipiente praesule Aius psallit, dicens latino cum greco.

Further on in the service we have

DE AIUS ANTE EVANGELIUM.

Tunc in adventu sancti Evangelii claro modulamine denuo psallet clerus Aius in specie angelorum ante faciem Christi, &c.

¹ In this and the following paragraphs, I am drawing largely on the account of the Gallican Service given by Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, and on the Gallican liturgies published by Mabillon, Muratori &c.

² Analecta Bollandiana, t. vii. p. 393.

³ Migne, Patr. Lat. t. LXXII. from Martene, Thes. Anecd. t. v.

Or if again we turn to the so-called Gallican Sacramentary published by Muratori from a Bobbio Ms. of the seventh century, which Muratori himself believed to come from the province of Besançon, where was the abbey of Luxeuil from whence Columban migrated to Italy, we shall find another instance of the curious pronunciation of the word in question. The Missal referred to begins with a ritual of mixed Roman and Gallican usage, headed "Missa Romensis Cottidiana." Here we find the sentences

Dicitur post Aios

Tu, summe Deus, Aios, ipse sanctus, omnipotens Sabaoth, etc.

And near the end

Collectio post Aios

Iudicia tua, Deus, etc.

There is, therefore, no doubt as to the pronunciation of the word in the Gallican Church, and in fact the last Ms. quoted carries the usage up to the seventh century. And this being so, we need not doubt that we have also the correct spelling in the Ms. of S. Germain previously quoted.

It would, therefore, seem that the pronunciation of the word "Aylos was "Alos at a very early time in the Gallican Church, before the Greek had disappeared from the service and been replaced by the Latin: for we need not suppose that in the cases referred to the spelling is due to the transcribers of some later period. It is evidently the spelling, as the pronunciation is the pronunciation, of the end of the sixth century.

The question which we ask then is this: are there any traces of similar phonetic decline in the Codex Bezae? can we find the form "Alos, or in default of this any similar forms? We know that the French language from an early period is full of such weakenings: the names of places shew it even better than the parts of speech. That Lugdunum, for example, in some way passes from its Kelto-Roman form (Llwych-dun) into the French Lyons is certain². So too Bordeaux stands for Burdigalium;

¹ Muratori, Museum Italicum, r. p. 273 sqq. Migne, Patr. Lat. LXXII. 448. Duchesne on p. 150 refers the publication of this sacramentary to Mabillon.

² The old catalogue of the Corbey Mss., which is referred to the eleventh

and Autun for an ancient Augustodunum; and Loire for Liger; in the same way the gulf of Lions derives its name, in all probability, from an original name 'sinus Ligusticus,' = $\Lambda \nu \gamma \dot{\nu} \omega \nu$, as it does not seem possible to connect it immediately with the city of Lyons'. Similarly in the case of some other letters, as Rhône for Rhodanus. Let us, then, see what similar forms occur in the Codex Bezae of the weakening of the "g" sound before a vowel either in the Greek or Latin.

In Luke viii. 36 we find in the Greek

απηγγείλαν γαρ αγτοίς οι ίδοντες πώς έςωθη ο λίων,

where Aiwn stands for Aefiwn as the Latin shews.

Is this a mere scribe's slip of the pen, or is it an attempt to represent the pronunciation?

In Acts xiii. 5 we have

KATHNEEINAN TON NON TOY KY

Was the scribe assisted in the error of writing λόγον as λον by the weakness of the middle consonant? Probably the reader will laugh at the idea; but let him turn to Acts xiii. 46, where he will read

γμείν πρώτον ην λαληθηναί τον λόν τος $\overline{\theta \gamma}$

and he will be obliged to admit that the repeated error is curious, if it be simply palaeographic, and not phonetic². Again in John xiv, 9 he will read

και πως ση λεις δείξον ημείν...

Then turn to the Latin text of the MS, and notice how often similar loss of syllables occurs,

In Matt. xxii. 5 we have

qui autem neglentes abierunt,

where we should expect negligentes.

century, shews an early stage of the corruption of the word: it gives *Herenei* episcopi Ludunensis contra omnes hereses.

¹ The name 'Sinus Ligusticus' does not seem, however, to have been traced west of Genoa.

² Probably a similar error is found in Luke viii. 53 και κατέλουν αυτον, where we should have κατέγελων: but the verb-form was changed to $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega$ and the γ not sounded in the compound word.

In Luke xx. 27

eius tacuerunt accentes autem.

for accedentes, is a similar case.

In Luke xxi. 23

erit enim nessitas magna super terra,

for necessitas. We begin then to suspect that, instead of the Beza text being a collection of blunders, it may be a valuable store-house of transitional forms in the language at a time when many changes were going on.

Are not these the very forms that we should expect in the early stages of a language which made eo and jo out of ego, froid out of frigidus, soleil out of soleculus, genou out of genoculum, fraile out of fragile, trente out of triginta, bonheur out of bonum augurium, and the like? We must clearly carry our enquiry after French and late Vulgar Latin forms in the Codex Bezae much further, and be prepared to find cases in which the scribe has been credited with blunders where he is phonetically perfectly correct.

Let us turn to Luke xi. 5

et ibit ad eum media nocte et dicit illi amie.

We should naturally pass this *amie* as a pure blunder, but we turn to Matt. xxvi. 50 and find nearly the same form

ad quod venisti ame,

so that the spelling is not an error of the unconscious kind: there is method in this scribe's noddings. We find ourselves here on the road to the French ami: and I think we may say that, if this instance is a good one, we part company at this point with any one who is disposed to hold that the scribe of the Beza Ms. was an Italian; for the Italian language preserves the form amico, i.e. it has hardly deviated from the Latin. Or again let us look at Matt. xxviii. 15, we have

apud iudaeos. usque in hoernum diem.

The word *hoernum* attracts attention from its deviation from the conventional *hodiernus*. We might pass it, but in Acts ii. 47 we find

cottie in unum in ecclesia,

where we should expect cottidie, and in Acts x. 30

et cornelius ait a nustertiana die,

where we ought to have *nudiustertiana*. In every case the syllable di has disappeared.

Now let us turn to the French language, and examine the form which the Latin hodie takes; we have as its equivalent aujourd'hui where hui evidently stands for hodie; the change being the same as in the Beza Codex. And again we see that this is not the change which we should expect from an Italian scribe, who would write something nearer to the modern form oggi.

Let us now look at some curious verb-forms. Turning to Luke ix. 3, we find

et sanare infirmos et dix ad eos,

where we should naturally say, ex errore pro dixit.

But let us compare Mark vi. 27,

sed statim mis speculatore,

for misit speculatorem, and we see that it is a similar case to the preceding; and the dropping of the final syllable is not accidental, it is the result of phonetic law. And as in the French the unaccented syllable weakens away so that dixit becomes in French dit, (for dist?), and in Italian disse, our scribe throws off the final syllable of his verb-forms.

In words of more than two syllables, the weakness is usually felt in the syllable after the tone, where the middle consonant, as we have shewn by many instances, will drop out and a new combination of vowels will take place.

In Mark i. 3,

rectas fate semitas di nostri,

the first hand has written the letters ci over fate; but we may reasonably believe that he had a motive for his first erroneous transcription, i.e. the spelling which he gives is the local Vulgar Latin pronunciation of the verb: which is exactly represented by the modern Italian, and stands very near indeed to what the French form must have been before the supplemental s in faites was developed (probably by analogy).

We can support this reasoning by another similar case, of weakness in a word in common usage, in Matt. xviii. 25,

Non hante eo unde redderet,

where we ought to have habente. This hante is the first stage towards the French ayant. And that the syllable in question really was subject to this weakness may be seen, as we shall shew by and by, by the French and other Romance futures, where we find the Vulgar Latin cantare habeo become chanterai because habeo itself reduces to ai.

This case speaks more strongly for a French locality than for an Italian, because, although the Italian exhibits some cases of the weakened forms of habeo (as ho, hanno against ebbe, etc.), yet in this participial form it writes avendo and thus preserves the b sound.

Occasionally in the Beza Ms. we find a point placed over a letter, but it is not easy to see with what intention, whether it is to indicate something as to the breathing, or whether it is a simple erasure of the letter in question, or non-sounding of it by the reader. For instance, in Mark xiv. 3, we find

ampullam nardi pistici praetiosi,

where the word ampullam, which seems to be a diminutive of amphora, is marked with a point as if the writer wished to pronounce it ammulam or amulam. And he has done something of the same kind in Mark xiv. 13 where he has marked amphorae in the same way, as if again the letter p were not to be sounded. But did the Vulgar Latin speech really say amula in the time when the Codex Bezae is supposed to have been written? Let us examine; there is a ninth-century MS. of the Ordo Romanus (Cod. Parisinus 974) written probably by a Frankish hand, which Duchesne has published as an Appendix to his Origines du Culte Chrétien. The writer says expressly that he is writing in the Vulgar-Latin: "Curavimus, non grammatico sermone, sed aperte loquendo veritatem indicare." The MS. was originally in the possession of the church of Saint-Amand en Puelle, being inscribed with the words "Almae ecclesiae sancti Amandi in Pabula liber." We should naturally regard it, then, as a French Ms.

When the writer describes the offerings made for the altar he expresses himself as follows:

Et diaconi recipiunt amulas et portatur stationarius calix a subdiacono regionario, et refundit diaconus ammulas in ipso calice sancto. Et dum repletus fuerit, devacuatur in sciffo quas portant acholithi.... Deinde revertitur (pontifex) ad permanent diaconi ad amulas recipiendas.

Further on he uses the alternative term ampulla; e.g.

tune vadunt diaconi et tollent ampullas cum oleo que ponuntur a diversis etc. $^{1}\!\!\!\!$

Et venit ad eum regionarius secundus et accipit ab eo ampullas eum balsamo.

Et vadet ante pontificem et stat ante eum cum ampulla².

It appears then from the Ms. that it was proper in the Vulgar Latin of the period to pronounce the word as amula; and this explains the occurrence of the erasing point in the Codex Bezae.

This may seem to be a trifle; but it is just such trifles as these that confirm the argument for the Gallic origin of the scribe of Codex Bezae.

Having noticed, then, the way in which the scribe has indicated the pronunciation which he wished the reader to follow in the case of the word *ampulla*, let us see whether there are any similar cases in the text, where a letter is marked for erasure, or where attention is called to it for any other purpose.

In Acts xx. 31,

quia triennio nocte ac die,

it seems reasonable to suppose that the c in nocte was not sounded, so that the word was already far in decline towards the forms which we find in French as nuit and in Italian as notte. Nor is it surprising that the weakness of the speech should show itself early in a common word like this. The form given in the Ms. is a shade nearer to the Italian than the French, but is recognized to be the parent of them both; the forms being taken from the oblique noctem where m is no longer sounded.

A very curious case occurs in Acts xix. 36,

oportet vos questos esse.

¹ Duchesne, l.c. p. 450.

The crasing point comes in here on account of a tendency in the Vulgar Latin to break up words artificially into imaginary compounds: thus they separated prodest prodesse etc. into prode est and prode esse, until at last prode came to be regarded as a real word, even as early as in the Codex Claromontanus. It is found also in Cod. Bezae in Luke ix. 25. Something similar seems to have happened to oportet: for Schuchardt quotes one case of its decomposition (viz. oportum est), and it is possible that the pronunciation of our Ms. intimates a similar change.

In Acts vi. 8 the scribe has marked the p in stephanus with a point of crasure; meaning, as I suppose, that it was no longer sounded: the letter is, in fact, absent from the French Étienne, but is preserved in Italian (Stefano).

In Acts xx. 9,

sedens autem quidam iubenis,

the scribe intimates the non-pronunciation of the final s in sedens; sometimes he actually drops the participal ending, as in Acts xix. 16,

insilien in eos homo.

These participial endings we shall discuss more at length by and by.

If we compare the French celui with its old form icelui, we shall see that the first word of the pair ecce illui, out of which it has been derived, has been subject to aphaeresis; and a similar thing must be said of the form icist = cist, and of the Italian costui which must be traced to ecce istui. It is interesting to notice the traces of this weakening in the first syllable of ecce in the writing of our Ms.

In Luke xvii. 21,

neque dicent ecce hic aut cce illi,

where we should pass it as a blunder if it were not that the same thing occurred in Luke xiv. 2,

observantes eum et cce homo.

We may take it then that our scribe was disposed not to sound the initial vowel, and this feature is the first stage of

¹ Der Vokalismus des Vulgar-lateins, II. 504, 505.

the aphaeresis of the syllable in the Romance languages. In Matt. iv. 11 we have

et e ce angeli accesserunt,

which is a curious case of the syllable-division, but whether the initial letter is sounded is uncertain. The point is near the top of the line and may intimate the erasure of the e.

Reviewing the series of illustrations which have been given above of forms which may properly be called Romance Forms, we may conclude that the balance of the evidence is in favour of regarding the Ms. as a Gallic rather than an Italian production. And if this were so, we should hardly expect that in the sixth century it was very far from the place where Beza said it was found; i.e. Lyons, or, as Beza says in his last edition (probably acting on better information), Clermont in the Auvergne.

We shall now pass from those forms which belong to the Romance languages to the forms which belong more nearly to the Vulgar Latin of the Empire, and try and extract from them some account of their local habitations.

Additional Note to c. iv. on Scholz's list of Gallicisms in the Codex Bezae.

We are now in a position to examine Scholz's crucial instance of Gallicism in the Codex Bezae: viz. the use of the word *soniis* as a translation of $\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\mu\nu\alpha\iota s$ in Luke xxi. 34. Concerning this word Scrivener notes (pp. xliv f.):

"Scholz and others have noticed soniis (μεριμναις) in Luke xxi. 34 only, for which a, e have solicitudinibus; b, f cogitationibus; c and the Vulgate curis. That sonius, which is not a Latin word at all, is connected with soinus and the French soin is plain enough, and Ducange cites from one Latin and Greek Glossary 'somnium φροντίς ιδιωτικώς,' from another 'somnior μεριμνώ,' whence was corrupted sonius, thence soinus and soin. ('Nisi competens soinus eum detineat.' Leges Henr. I. Regis Angliae cap. 29 in Ducange Medii Aevi Latinitas, sub voce Sunnis.)"

Now in the first place, we need not hesitate to regard *somnium* in the Glossaries quoted as a mere error, or at all events an equivalent of *sonium*. For Ducange points out the following cases of substitution of the former word for the latter:

Vetus placitum in Vita Aldrici episc. Cenoman. p. 110. Ne infirmitas aut legitima somnis eum detinuerit, etc.

Ita perperam somnis habetur in lege Langobard, lib. 2, tit. 43, \S 1, et sumnis lib. 3, tit. 23, \S 3.

It seems clear that these alternative spellings are mere scribe's errors, and that the real spelling of the word is *sunnis* or *sonnis*, which would answer very well to the *sonium* of our text; and would certainly be the parent of the French word *soin*.

Two things may be said with regard to this word; on the one hand, it has every appearance of being a German word: on the other, it occurs in all the Romance languages, and must therefore be regarded as Low Latin. Its earliest appearance is in the laws of the Franks. Let us turn to the Salic Law, and we shall find as follows:

xlvii. ...Et si quis commonitus fuerit et eum sunnis non tenuerit et ad placitum venire distulerit tunc ille qui cum eum negotiavit mittat tres testes quomodo ei nunciasset ut ad placitum veniret.

We have only to compare with this allusion to a detention by *sunns*, the authorities cited by Ducange under *essoin*, to see that the two words are equivalent:

Essonia, exonia, exonium. Essonium de malo lecti, cum quis morbo ita detinetur in lecto ut ad judicium venire non potest...Prima statuta Roberti Regis Scotiae. Pro essonio, quod Gallice vocatur mal de lit, hoc est malum de lecto, Anglice Bed evill. Essoine de maladie residente in Consuet. Ms. Normann.

Essoine is therefore the French equivalent of exonium, artificially formed from sonium.

But if the word occurs so early as the Salic Law, it may be suggested that it is a Frankish word; and if we turn to Kern's account of the Frankish words in the lex Salica¹ we find the following suggestions:

§ 231. Sunni, stem sunnia (which occurs already in Tit. I, and which we find again in Sect. 2), means a lawful excuse, impedimentum legitimum, exceptio. The M. D. (Middle Dutch) word is nootsinne: O. N. nauðsyn; a derivative is N. D. verb vernootsingen to excuse (sig=oneself) by proving a lawful impediment; in the municipal law of Zutphen "ten ware sake dat hij sig dede vernootsinnigen, te weten dat hij door lijfsmoodt, watersmoodt, ofti heerengebodt verhindert ware geweest."

Kern goes on to suggest a connexion with the Gothic sunja, truth; sunjon sik ἀπολογεῖσθαι, sunjons ἀπολογία, and the Latin sontica causa, insons.

That is, Kern does not feel quite clear in his mind as to whether he is dealing with a word derived from the Gothic *sunja* or the Latin *sons*. What is certain is that the word in question is in use among the Salian Franks at the very earliest period, viz. before the time of writing of the Codex Bezae. And since the word passes over into the French language, it is not surprising that its occurrence was hailed as a convincing proof of Gallicism. But we must not make such conclusion too rapidly, for, as we have intimated, the

¹ Hessel's edition, p. 538.

word turns up in all the Romance languages: if we are to regard soin and essoin as belonging to this stem, we can hardly exclude besoin: and this group of words is widely diffused: we have the Provençal besonh bezonh, the old Catalonian bessonh, the Italian bisogno, and the Rhaeto-romanian basengs, to set against the Old French besoing; and just in the same way as the French témoin is derived by temoing from the Latin testimonium, we may infer a Low-Latin word sonium if not besonium. In the same way we find the Provençal sonh soing, suenh, and the Old Italian sogna, and the Wallachian sogn, over against the French soin.

It will be seen that we have here a veritable problem: if we say that we are dealing with a Germanic stem, we must go on to recognize that besoin contains a Germanic prefix bi equivalent to the modern German bei; and we have then to assume that the words in question came into France with the Frankish invaders and into Italy with the Lombards, which would of course explain why it turns up in the Salic laws, in the laws of Childebert and Chlotarius and in the laws of the Lombards.

But it is very difficult to believe that besoin is a German word, in view of the fact that no trace of it can be found in the German speech, while every Romance language has it.

The other supposition is that the word is truly a Romance word, and the prefix bes has been added, which in Romance languages gives a bad sense to the word to which it is attached, so that if soin meant simply care, besoin would mean anxiety and so necessity.

To this Diez objects that in that case the Romance languages ought to show the word written with a double s: and Littré replies that the double letter does occur in the Old Catalonian.

It seems to me that this latter hypothesis must be the true one: we may take it for granted that the Latin term sontica causa is the equivalent in the Roman Law for the sunnis of the Law books quoted above: but if that be the case, it can hardly be an accident that Frankish lawyers called a legal excuse by the name of sunnis which compares so well with the Roman sons, which is the root of sontica. The early Frankish and Lombard lawyers must therefore have been under the influence of the Roman Law, and the word which they use is a Roman legal loan-word.

There is then no difficulty about the diffusion of the word in the Roman speech.

In any case it will be difficult to limit the word as found in the Codex Bezae to the position of the country under the power of the Frankish invaders. It might just as easily be an Italian word: and while we readily admit that if the Frankish origin could be established, the word in the Codex would fairly belong to a scribe writing under Frankish dominion, and so Scholz's contention would be established; yet we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the word may after all be Vulgar Latin and not necessarily Vulgar Latin of as late a

¹ Ducange. Adde placitum Childeberti et Chlotarii § 5. Si placitum sunnis non detricaverit.

period as the sixth century. I do not then think that it is clear that soniis has been substituted for some earlier word solicitudinibus or cogitationibus: it is quite possible that it may be an archaic translation, for which various substitutes have been suggested by transcribers and re-translators.

Scholz also points out that in the Codex Bezae in John x. 10 involet is a translation of $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\psi n$, and we may suppose that it was the similarity between the word and the French voler which made him register the form as Gallic. More cautiously Scrivener, discussing the theory of Scholz, says, "less certain is the inference drawn from involet as a translation of κλέψη in John x. 10 only, all the other versions having furetur in this place. Involo is rendered by Ducange per vim auferre and compared with the French voler, but Servius, the Commentator on Virgil in the 5th century, says 'Vola dicitur media pars manus...unde et involare dicimus, quum aliquid furtim vola manus substrahitur." He then refers to Catullus, Carm. xxv. for a case of the use of the word, and might equally well have referred to Pliny. This, of itself, is enough to make one suspicious about the Gallican theory. And when we notice further that the word on one side appears in the Salic Law in the form embulare (whence the Old French embler), and on the other that it is a common word in modern Italian (involare involatore &c.), we need scarcely hesitate to say that the proofs of its exclusively Gallican usage are not forthcoming.

Probably a more convincing way of proving Gallicism in the Codex Bezae would be to compare its palaeographic and phonetic peculiarities with those of a companion Ms. which has a similar presumption in favour of a French origin, viz. the famous Old Latin Pentateuch of Lyons, which was published in 1881 by M. Ulysse Robert with a very complete exposition.

The Lyons Pentateuch is not nearly so eccentric a Ms. as the Codex Bezae; it is more carefully written and the text shews signs of more thorough revision. Yet there are not wanting signs by which we can determine something as to the nationality of the first scribe.

Suppose, for example, we were to test the Ms. in order to see whether it ever dropped the weak intervocalic g whose omission is so common in Cod. Bezae. We should, I think, find only a single instance, viz.

sarcophaum for sarcophagum.

But this single instance would have to be set with the αios of the French Churches and $\lambda [\epsilon \gamma] i\omega \nu$ and other cases in the Codex Bezae.

Again if we were to look for the similar case of the disappearance of intervocalic c, as in the Beza form fute for fucite &c., we should find the Lyons Pentateuch writing feerit for fecerit. It may be an accident, but it is just such cases that make one suspicious.

¹ Vaniçek derives the word from the Sanskrit gvola.

Many other minor coincidences of spelling may be noted, such as the metathesis of the aspiration in proper names etc., e.g. while Cod. Bezae in Acts xvi. 16 writes *phytonem* for *pythonem*, the Lyons Pentateuch in Exod. i. 11 turns *Pithom* into *Phythonam*.

These are trifling instances and the subject demands a close and careful examination. I believe it would turn out, upon investigation, that both of the Mss. in question are bona-fide Rhône-valley Mss. as far as their scribes are concerned, but the problem only begins at this point; for what we really want to know is the nationality of the first translators of the Septuagint and New Testament.

We shall, from time to time, as our argument proceeds, point out any phonetic and linguistic concurrences between the two MSS. in question.

The very same results appear, when we proceed to test the Old Latin Ms. of S. Germain (g^1) , in order to see whether it shews any traces of the striking disappearance of the intervocalic c and g in the Old French, or of similar phonetic weaknesses. A reference to Wordsworth's edition of this Ms. will give us the following information on the point¹.

"G appears to have had a very slight sound between two vowels, being often omitted in *tetii* (Matt. ix. 21, 29; xiv. 35; xx. 34), and so in xxvii. 31, crucifierent: cf. xiv. 25 uilia for uiqilia, and dinus for diquus in Luke xii. 16."

These cases must be added to our previous ones; they furnish us with confirmation of our theory that Cod. Bezae and Cod. Sangermanensis are both French in origin. In *vilia* for *vigilia* we have the equivalent of the French *veille*.

¹ Old Latin Biblical Texts, No. I., p. xxxix.

CHAPTER V.

VULGAR LATIN OF THE CODEX BEZAE.

WE now return to the discussion of the Vulgar-latinisms. The MS. is full of Vulgar Latin forms, which seem to cover a good period of time; some of them we have already discussed, where they were so far advanced as to be capable of identification with known forms in Provencal, Italian or Old French. But there are many which belong to a more remote period and which do not admit of such definite classification. We do not know what was the primitive text from which Codex Bezae derived its Latin or its Greek; it is an open question yet whether it is European or African, Roman or Gallican. We must be prepared for anything in the way of philological surprises. If in our new enquiry into the Vulgar Latin we should find Africanisms we shall simply have to say that, so far as these are traceable, the Ms. must be described as a Gallican Ms. made upon an African base. forms occur which are Roman rather than Gallican, or South-Italian rather than North-Italian, we must say similar things. The whole problem of the origin of the Latin versions is to be left an open question: for our text may well contain by inheritance many peculiarities which are not capable of explanation as Gallicisms of the sixth century.

One caution must be premised: we know enough now of the Codex Bezae to make us very careful not to refer to the blunders of scribes the rare forms which we find in the Latin and in the Greek: these forms are our best landmarks, and we must be very careful not to reject them hastily. When we find an assumed error of spelling repeating itself in the text at different

parts, we learn that we are dealing not with an error, but with a phonetic peculiarity. Sufficient instances of this have already been given, and more are yet to follow.

When, for instance, we find that the scribe spells carcar twice¹ against carcer twenty-eight times, we must reflect that carcar is a genuine collateral form, which may be frequently found in the Acta Fratrum Arvalium², and is also attested by the Greek loanword $\kappa\acute{a}\rho\kappa a\rho\sigma$ s.

So when we find *jajunare* seven times against fifteen times of *jejuno*, we shall register the spelling as giving us another sideform.

When we find in Acts xx. 20, 27 the forms substraxerim substraxi, we do not say that this is a mere cockneyism of the scribe; for we recall the French soustraire which is commonly referred to a Vulgar Latin subtustraho, for which the classical Latin knows only subtraho³.

Again when we find congaudebant in Luke i. 58 and cumgaudete in Luke xv. 6 etc., we may not refer it, as Scrivener does, to the barbarism of a scribe who is trying to render literally $\sigma v\gamma\chi ai\rho\omega$, for the word is not only attested in the oldest Romance speech, e.g. Provençal congauzir; French, conjouir, but it appears also in the Latin of Tertullian and Cyprian⁴.

We shall then regard it, for the present, as a genuine Vulgar Latin form of wide diffusion; for it cannot be shewn that all these writers and dialects have taken it from a translation of the Scriptures.

But in order to impress the reader more forcibly with the need that there is for a fresh scrutiny of Codex Bezae in search of lost or obsolescent forms, we will point out one very striking case in which it has preserved an early Latin form, undoubtedly archaic and belonging to prae-classical times.

¹ Luke iii. 20; Acts xxi. 12.

² Cf. C. I. L. vol. vi. pars 1, p. 513 (A.D. 87), p. 517 (A.D. 89), p. 533 (A.D. 105), p. 535 (A.D. 117), p. 541 (A.D. 120), etc.

³ Here the Italian is sottrarre: which seems to come from the classical form.

⁴ Rönsch, *Itala u. Vulgata*, shews the word to belong to all the Old Latin texts in 1 Cor. xii. 26, and refers to Cyprian, *Ep.* 50, Ambrose, *Ep.* 6. 34 and Sulp. Severus, *Ep.* ii. *ad Aurel.* 11.

Let us look at Acts v. 38

oti εαν η εξ ανθρωπων η Βούλη αυτη Qvia sic erit ab hominibys consilivm istyd.

Notice that $\epsilon \hat{a} \nu$ is translated by sic: we should naturally let this pass as a scribe's blunder; but as we read on, we find in Acts vii. 2

ει αρα τούτο ούτως εχεί • ο δε εφη

for which the Latin is

AIT AVTEM PONTIFEX STEPHANO
SIC HAEC SIC HABENT • AD ILLE DIXIT.

Here we notice that the Latin translator, who is following the Greek word for word, has again translated ϵi (more exactly ϵi $\alpha \rho a$) by sic. Now it might be maintained that this was merely an anticipation of the following sic: but this is insufficient when we recall that there has been a suspicion in our own minds from the previously observed case, and in the minds of philologers in general, that the Latin si was derived from an original sic. And indeed we find the word in Plautus in the form $sice^1$, and hence (see Vaniçek, p. 971) we are entitled to regard the word as made up from a root sa + enclitic ke; and so to equate it directly with the Greek ϵi $\kappa \epsilon$. Let us now turn back to John xxi. 22, where we find

KE OYTOC ΔΕ ΤΙ · ΛΕΓΕΙ ΔΥΤΏ Ο ΙΗΟ ΕΑΝ ΑΥΤΌΝ ΘΕΛΏ ΜΕΝΕΊΝ ΟΥΤΏΟ DME HIC AVTEM QVID · DICIT ILLI IHS SI EVM VOLO SIC MANERE.

Bearing in mind that our translator has been convicted twice of rendering ϵi and $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu$ by sic, we see at once the cause of the eccentric reading in the Ms. Evidently it once stood

SIC EVM VOLO MANERE,

and this has been corrected, probably on the margin, and the correction has found its way into the text without displacing the original reading. A study of other Western texts shews the same feature with slight variations, and it even passed into the Vulgate;

¹ Probably sic erit in Acts v. 38 was originally sice sit.

my collation of the Amiatinus (a copy which Tregelles made and lent to Tischendorf) has the following note in Tischendorf's hand on the margin against vv. 22 and 23;

Ed. Fleckii bis *Sic* nec ego quicquam contra notavi.

So that we see the reading to belong to the regular tradition of the Vulgate; and to have been registered by Fleck, though apparently overlooked by Tregelles, in this Codex.

Further, we find the reading $sic\ eum\ volo$ in $b\ c\ g$ and in Ambrose: in $v.\ 23$, where a is extant, we also find it. A reference to the Codex Fuldensis shews the same reading in both places: in $v.\ 22$ the text stood $si\ sic\ eum\ volo\ manere$, but Victor of Capua erased the si. The Corbey Ms. f_2 seems to have the same conflate reading $(si\ sic)$ in $v.\ 22$, though it omits the disputed word altogether in $v.\ 23^1$.

Now here we have a most interesting study of an undoubtedly Western reading. We need have no hesitation in saying that all early Western texts read originally sic eum volo in both verses. Moreover the reading is a perfectly correct one, as long as we take sic in its archaic meaning εἴ κε. But when this form became obsolete, the Latin texts became subject to correction and so to conflation; and after a time the Greek text was re-acted upon either from the primitive or from the conflated Latin, and the word ούτως was inserted as we find it in Codex Bezae: so that we have a crucial case by which we shew that to some extent the Western Greek text has latinized, though how far that influence extended is a great problem. Moreover this reading shews that all these Latin texts have a common Latin root if we go back far enough: for it is very unlikely that separate translators should have agreed in writing in this passage the archaic form The common root into which they recede is the sic for si. first line-for-line translation of the Latin Gospels of which we have a somewhat late form exhibited in Codex Bezae.

¹ I do not wish to complicate the question by discussing at the same time the origin of Cod. k: and so will simply note that in Mark ix. 43 this ms. shews "et sic scandalizaterit manus tua." The Lyons Pentateuch also in Lev. v. 1 renders ἐὰν μὴ ἀπαγγείλη λήψεται τὴν ἀμαρτίαν by sic non rettulerit accipiet delictum.

This will seem to be rather a summary method of dealing with the Old Latin texts, and I am afraid that it will seem especially suspicious to Dr Sanday who has done such excellent pioneer work in the classification of the early Latin copies. In Old Latin Bible Texts No. ii. p. 122 Dr Sanday expresses his belief that "it is only by the method here pursued, viz. by the systematic examination of whole groups of readings, that a satisfactory conclusion will ever be arrived at." The caution expressed is in the main a wise one. And yet Dr Sanday sometimes sees the necessity of building high upon what seems to be a narrow foundation; for on p. 116 he says, "In St Mark ix. 15, the Greek προστρέχοντες has been corrupted to προσχέροντες (for προσχαίροντες), which is represented by gaudentes in the Latin of c d ff, ik. It seems difficult to avoid the inference that these MSS. in spite of all their divergences have after all a common origin." No doubt it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, but was the origin a Greek MS. or a Latin? Is the unity one of derivation from a version or from a copy? The question is an important one, because, besides the authorities quoted by Dr Sanday, the same evidence is given by Cod. b, which reads cadentes for gaudentes, and by the Tatian Harmony. Perhaps the evidence accumulated by Dr Sanday is not quite decisive on the question, but we may at least affirm that we may build upon a single passage in the Gospels, provided we interpret it rightly. And the case which we have proposed above has the advantage over Dr Sanday's case in this that it is certain that the common error (if we indeed are right in calling it an error, for we have shewn that sic is a lawful form for si) is a translator's error, and the translator is the ancestor of Codex Bezae. From this translation all the others that we have named depend. And we may suspect that the Old Latin texts a b c g^1 and the copy used by Ambrose, to say nothing of other copies, are framed upon a primitive bilingual text of which Codex Bezae is the great representative. We shall develop the proof of this position as the argument proceeds. Meanwhile it will be a good study to set these early translations, sentence by sentence, over against the text of Codex Bezae, and watch the way in which one copy or another evaded the harshness and removed the provincialisms from the parent text.

not a few cases it will be found that peculiar readings of our Codex escape correction, and so appear in texts whose Latin is of a very correct type; while, on the opposite hand, there are no doubt cases where the comparison will throw back archaisms from the younger texts upon the parent text of the Beza manuscript.

Having said so much by way of suggestion, let us now return to the curious Latin reading *sic* for *si*, from the consideration of which we have digressed.

We may now go a step further: Scrivener¹ suggests that in the year 1546 the Codex Bezae was in Italy. His reasoning is as follows: "William à Prato, Bishop of the city of Clermont in the adjoining² province of Auvergne, produced to the Council of Trent in 1546 a very ancient Greek manuscript confirming the Latin reading sic eum volo in John xxi. 22, which Cod. D alone of all known authorities might appear to do: when his end was served, the Bishop would of course restore it to his neighbours the monks of St Irenaeus, from whom he had borrowed it."

Scrivener is quoting from Wetstein N. T. proll. p. 28, who says

Postquam diu latuisset codex noster, iterum in lucem productus est circa tempora Concilii Tridentini, quod conjicio ex Mariani Victorii notis in Hieronymum, in quibus citatur "antiquissimus Graecus Codex, quem Tridentum attulerat Claromontanus Episcopus A° 1546": is erat, ut ex Actis Synodicis constat, Gulielmus a Prato, qui, ad locum Ioann. xxi. 22, prout in Latinis exemplaribus legitur, confirmandum istius codicis Graeca protulit, $\hat{\epsilon}$ àv að $\hat{\tau}$ $\hat{\tau}$

But have we the right to go so far as to say that the bishop of Clermont's Codex was the Codex Bezae? Wetstein's quotation is evidently from the Codex Bezae; but what of Marianus Victorius? Evidently he wished for some reason or other to confirm the reading $o\ddot{\upsilon}\tau\omega$ s. But what was the reason, and whence did Marianus Victorius get his information? A reference to the notes on the first book of Jerome against Jovinianus will give the actual words of the editor:

Si eum sic volo esse, quid ad te? D. Hieronymus legit, sicut habet anti-

¹ Codex Bezae p. viii,

² i.e. to Lyons.

quissimus quidam Graecus Codex quem Tridentum attulit Claromontanensis Episcopus anno Domini 1549, $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{a}\nu$ $a\hat{v}\hat{\tau}\hat{o}\nu$ $\theta\hat{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ $\mu\hat{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\nu$ $o\hat{v}\tau\omega$ s $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega$ s $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\chi o\mu a\iota$. Cui consentit Latinus qui est in Basilica S. Pauli, a Carolo Magno illi Ecclesiae donatus, et vulgatus ubique Sacrarum Missarum Codex, et alii tres, duo qui sunt in monasterio Sublacensi, et tertius quem ego legi in monasterio S. Dionysii Parisiensis.

It appears, then, that Marianus Victorius was adducing the bishop of Clermont as confirming the reading not in its archaic form sic eum volo, but in a more evolved form, after conflation had taken place. But since he gives us the Greek text, there is little reason to doubt that the Codex Bezae is the Ms. in question, the agreement on this point being exact.

The reason for referring to the passage at all in the Council of Trent is a little more difficult to detect. But we may make one or two points with some confidence.

It might at first be supposed that the verse was a test question as to the authority of the Vulgate against the Greek in a matter of divergent texts; and this would agree with the fact that the bishop of Clermont was present in the Council and took part in the debates on the question of the authority of the Scriptures. But I can find no allusion in the published accounts of the Tridentine Council to any such dispute over the verse in John xxi. And indeed the selection of such a passage as a test-case would imply a degree of scholarship altogether too refined. We may suspect then that the question at issue was something of a different kind, to which the verse in dispute was more applicable than the rest of the Scripture: and it is easy to see what this question was; for Jerome quotes the passage in order to base on it an argument for the perpetual virginity of St John; sic manere is the expression of the perpetual celibacy of the beloved disciple. Now this question comes up in the Council in connexion with the dispute as to which estate of life has the higher sanctity, the married or the single. It is true that it does not come up during the first part of the Council at which William à Prato was present, but many years later, when the Council had been reassembled. But this need not prevent us from believing that the question was much discussed in private, in the earlier years of the Council.

The fact is that the verse in St John, as read in the Latin or in the Beza-text, formed a very appropriate pendant to the doctrine of 1 Cor. vii. 40 $\mu a \kappa a \rho \iota \omega \tau \epsilon \rho a \delta \epsilon \epsilon \delta \sigma \iota \iota \nu \epsilon \delta \nu o \upsilon \tau \omega s \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \eta$: and the similarity of the language invited the interpretation which we find in Jerome. Consequently we find, when the Canon on Virginity is brought forward in the Council, after the twenty-third formal session, that it appears in the following forms: on July 20th, 1563, it is the IXth Canon:

IX. Si quis dixerit matrimonium anteponendum esse virginitati, vel coelibatui, et non esse melius et beatius manere in virginitate et coelibatu $(=o\tilde{v}\tau\omega s)$ quam iungi in matrimonio, anathema sit.

On Oct. 26 it is the Xth Canon,

X. Si quis dixerit statum conjugalem anteponendum esse statui virginitatis vel coelibatui, et non esse melius ac beatius manere in virginitate aut coelibatu, quam iungi matrimonio, anathema sit.

And we suspect, as we have said, that the reason for the quotation from St John was that it was supposed to have a bearing on the question of virginity, as implied in $o\~v\tau\omega$ s $\mu e\~v\tau\eta$ of 1 Cor. We need have no hesitation in accepting Marianus Victorius' evidence about the Greek Ms. and its reading, for he is an almost contemporary Italian bishop and had therefore every reason, both as a cleric and a scholar, to know the facts of the case. His Jerome was published at Rome in 1566, and he himself died in 1572, not long after he had been elected bishop of Rieti.

We may correct the date 1549, which I find in the notes to Jerome; it must stand 1546, for the Council was hardly in active existence in 1549; nor is there any evidence that the bishop of Clermont was at any session later than the seventh, i.e. up to March 1547; though he made a powerful address before the assembled fathers on Jan. 9th, 1547 (a copy of which may be found in Le Plat, III. 481), and frequently took part in the earlier debates 1,

¹ His bishopric is Clermont-Ferrand in the Auvergne; he was elected to the see on Feb. 16, 1528 and died in the year 1561 (according to Gams 22 x. 1560, which seems to be the same date differently reckoned). He was the founder of the Jesuit College of Clermont at Paris and of several other institutions. He was buried in the Convent of the Friars Minims of Beauregard, which again seems to have been one of his own foundations.

We have seen then that there is reason to believe that the Codex Bezae was at the Council of Trent; and that it was referred to in order to support a Latin rendering, when, as a matter of fact, the Greek had already been corrected to the Latin, although there was not the least reason to have made a correction at all, if only the vulgar speech had been kept in mind!

The proof that the archaic Latin rendering of the New Testament employed the form *sic* for *si* may be confirmed by shewing how widely this form prevails in the popular Latin literature of the same period. If the reader will take the trouble to examine the Old Latin of Irenaeus, he will find that the MSS. and edited texts are full of misunderstandings arising out of the interpretation and correction of the ambiguous word. A few instances may be given.

It will be remembered that the text of Irenaeus is based upon three principal Mss.: the Clermont Ms. (formerly in the Jesuit College at Paris), the Arundel Ms. in the British Museum, and the Vossian Codex at Leyden. Other Mss. are occasionally alluded to by the first editors, but their whereabouts is in most cases unknown.

Irenaeus ed. Harvey, II. 318 = Mass. 293.

Si autem non salvetur haec videlicet, nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, neque calix Eucharistiae communicatio sanguinis ejus est.

This reading, according to Harvey and Stieren, is found in the Clermont and Vossian MSS. while the Arundel MS. reads sic autem and is supported by an Ottobonian Codex. The latter form is, no doubt, to be restored.

II. 339 = Mass. 301.

Sic ergo pignus hoc habitans in nobis iam spirituales efficit, et absorbetur mortale ab immortalitate.

Here the Clermont and Vossian Mss. (with perhaps some collateral support known to the earlier editors of Irenaeus) read sic for si. The form should again be restored.

II. 356 = Mass. 308.

Sic enim proprie de carne hoc dictum dicent, et non de carnalibus operationibus, quemadmodum demonstrabimus, ipsum sibi contraria Apostolum dicentem contraria ostendentes.

Here, according to Harvey, the Clermont, Arundel and Vossian MSS. read sic, other authorities si. Stieren merely says "Ita

Clarom. Voss. et Mass.: melius quam reliqui si enim." The sense requires si enim, but the older form should be printed.

II. 384 = Mass. 319.

Sic igitur manifeste ostendente Domino quoniam Dominus verus et unus Deus qui a lege declaratus fuerat...iam non oportet quaerere alium Patrem.

Here the editors Harvey and Stieren read sic against the Vossian and Clermont Mss. which have si. The confusion between the two forms is again apparent. We follow the editors in restoring the form sic, and leave the interpretation of the word an open question.

II. 395 = Mass. 324.

Si ergo Deus magnus significavit per Danielem futura et per Filium confirmavit,...confutati resipiscant qui Demiurgum respuunt, etc.

Here Stieren notes: "Feuardentius e codice veteri, quocum Voss. consentit, scripsit sic ergo. Sed cum Grab. et Mass. nostram lectionem restitui propter meliorem connexionem verborum, quae sequuntur: confutati resipiscant."

Harvey adopts si which is clearly right, as far as the sense goes, without even a question or a note. But it is again a case of misunderstanding, and we should restore sic to the text.

II. 414 = Mass. 332.

Si ergo huic promisit Deus hereditatem terrae, non accepit autem in omni suo incolatu, oportet eum accipere, etc.

where Stieren notes on the reading si; "Ita cum Mass. scripsi. Reliqui e codd. habent sic, quod errore scribarum scriptum est."

The error is clearly one of interpretation, and the scribes are to be justified in preserving the old Vulgar Latin form.

Enough has been said to shew that the pages of Irenaeus are full of misunderstandings similar to the one which we detected in Cod. Bezae. The instances might be multiplied, but as the present discourse is not immediately concerned with the character of the Old Latin of Irenaeus, it is not necessary to deal with the subject exhaustively.

CHAPTER VI.

IS THE CODEX BEZAE A LATINIZING CODEX?

It will be seen that we have run up against a notable and apparently incontrovertible instance of what is called Latinization in the Codex Bezae. And as we have thus reopened what was a burning question of the last century, it will be well to stop and ask ourselves whether it is really true that such a retranslation of Latin into Greek can be admitted, and whether there are any other such cases. Leaving then, for a while, the discussion of the Vulgarlatinisms of the Ms., we proceed to shew that the instance in question is not an isolated case, but that the whole of the Greek text of Codex Bezae from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Acts is a re-adjustment of an earlier text to the Latin version.

This was the view of the earlier critics, such as Mill, Wetstein, Middleton, etc.: but it was supposed to have received a final quietus, by the discovery of the wide extent to which the so-called Western readings prevailed in manuscripts of all periods (and especially of early periods), and coming from all parts of the world.

Mill expressed himself, as follows, in his Greek Testament A.D. 1707¹.

Vidimus jam qualia fuerint Graeca, qualia item Latina hujusce codicis. De Graecis unum illud ultra quaeritur, an aliqua ex parte castigata fuerint ad Latinum exemplar? ea enim erat de libris hujus generis eruditorum quorundam nostrae et superioris aetatis diserta sententia. Nempe cum mirifice consenserint ista cum Latinis, contra quam reliqui Graeciae libri, iique optimi, facile ipsis persuasum est, ea vel non omnino fuisse Graecae originis, sed tota, quanta quanta, traducta de Latinis, vel saltem recensita et emendata fuisse variis sui partibus, ad Latinam Versionem. Sic de ipsis pronuntiant Erasmus, Lucas Brugensis, Estius, Grotius, alii; quorum sententiam nil mirum si in hac editione nostram fecerimus.

¹ Proleg. in N. T. p. exxxiv.

De hac re jam ita videtur. Exscripta erant apud Latinos, ex librorum, ad quos confecta erat Itala versio, apographis, varia Graeca exemplaria, ex ignorantia scribarum, doctiorumque e Latinis quorundam περιεργία (qui mutuata e Graecorum libris scholia, et Apocrypha fragmenta in codices ex suis descriptos inserenda curabant) graviter laesa et interpolata. Istis mox adaptabatur a quibusdam Latina Versio. Ex hac autem consensione forte factum est, ut indocta manus paucula hinc inde in textu Graeco ad formam Latinorum et e Latina versione mutaverit. illud enim apparet in Graecis Cant. Ηρώδους, Ιωάννους, Σαμαριτάνων, aliaque id genus ad Latinorum formam confecta sunt. Matt. v. 24, cum latinum esset offeres, πρόσφερε mutavit librarius in προσφερείς. ea enim ipsi erat secunda persona futuri. καταβαίνον, factum καταβαίνοντα ob lat. descendentem, iii, 16. Cap. xi, 22, 24 cum esset in lat, quam vobis et vero Graecum esset † vuiv, quae vobis (sic enim videbatur) mutavit in ην ύμιν ut latino responderet. Sic cap. ejusd. v. 28, factum est πάντες οί κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι έστε ob lat. omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis. Cap. xv. 18, 20, ob latina obsoleta (sed genuina interpretis Vulgati) communicat communicant i.e. polluit, polluint, pro κοινοί, κοινούντα reposuit absurde κοινωνεί κοινωνούντα. uti et Act. xxi. 28, εκοινώνησε τον άγιον τόπον τούτον, ob lat. communicarit sanctum locum hunc. Sic Matt. xviii. 22, έβδομηκοντάκις έπτάκις ob lat. septies. Act. v. 9, Συνεφώνησεν (pro συνεφωνήθη) ύμιν ob lat. convenit vobis. Mitto alia.

One would certainly have thought that such an array of instances, with the suggestion that there were others, would have provoked a very close examination of at least the syntax on the two sides of the Ms. Perhaps the real fault was that people accepted the opinion as to the Latinization of the Western Greek Codices too readily. There were polemic feelings which, in some cases at least, were still provoked by the suggestions of Latin authority. Wetstein in his prolegomena takes up very decided ground with Mill as to the fact of Latinization: and inveighs fiercely against Morinus who had in his Exercitationes Biblicae defended the consentient testimony of Latin and Latinizing codices as being the criterion of the true text: and concludes Morinus on this ground, as well as on that of private scandals, to be wholly unacquainted with the Greek language¹.

The very strong case made out by Mill and Wetstein was met by a temperate reply made in 1787 by J. D. Michaelis. He admits that some of the examples brought forward are very extraordinary, but replies that the Greek text in Codex Bezae sometimes varies

¹ Wetstein, Prolegg., Amstelodami (A.D. 1751), p. 32.

from the Latin, and he carries the war into the enemies' camp by suggesting that the Latin has in some cases been corrupted from the Greek. And he concludes by saying¹

The result of the preceding remarks is that the manuscript in question cannot possibly have been altered from the Latin, according to the charge which has been usually laid to it.... But till we are fully informed what readings are to be ascribed to the text itself and what to subsequent corrections, it is impossible to decide on this subject with any certainty; which we shall more easily obtain, if to the above mentioned information be added a diligent use of the Sahidic version.

And so he concludes to wait until Kipling's promised edition shall come out. The allusion to the Sahidic version was significant, for this version had been shewn to be full of Western readings.

Griesbach² threw the whole weight of his great authority against the theory of Latinization. In describing Codex L, which has such affinity in many readings with Cod. D, he refuses to admit that the consensus between readings of the Alexandrian and Western recensions is anything more than a consensus: very many Western readings had been introduced by mixture into Alexandrian texts. Such Greek readings were to be reckoned as derived from Greek MSS, unless it could be shewn that they could not have been derived from such a source, and that they could on the other hand have been derived from the Latin. The illustrations brought forward by the Latinizers shewed consent but not corruption: ("nil praeter illorum cum hac consensum ostendunt, neutiquam vero istos ex hac corruptos esse"). He will not be so wedded to his own opinion as to say that no glosses or readings ever crept from the Latin into the Greek: but most of these cases are of slight importance and there was no deliberate intent at latinizing the Greek. He instances λέπρωσος, and φλαγελλώσας. But actual readings of a latinizing kind are very rare. Griesbach intimates that a few such occur in the Acts in the Codex Alexandrinus. In any case, if one or two such readings occur, that is no reason for despising the rest of the Ms.

It is evident that Griesbach's views must have been the chief cause in the change of opinion upon the question of Latinization.

¹ Marsh's Michaelis, 11, 235.

² Symbolae Criticae, p. cxi.

And he was followed by Herbert Marsh, who in his notes on Michaelis' Introduction takes up the same ground'. Marsh points out that Semler, who at first, in 1764, when he had not emancipated himself from the influence of Wetstein, had expressed himself against the Western Graeco-Latin texts, put himself right in his Spicilegium Observationum in 1766 by saying "non licet mihi amplius eam tenere (sententiam) aut hunc codicem (sc. D) et graeco-latinos tam vehementer adspernari...Itaque istae accusationes omnes vanae sunt jam et temerariae." To which Marsh adds that the authors of the Latin versions must have found in the Greek manuscripts, from which they translated, the readings which are common to them and to the Codex Bezae: and this very agreement is a strong argument for the genuineness of the Western readings. No instance has been produced from the Codex Bezae of supposed latinizing which might not just as well be a genuine reading of the Greek.

Marsh's edition of Michaelis' Introduction and valuable supplementary notes on the same were published in 1793. And he remarks that Griesbach's system is at present received by every critic in Europe. It would seem, therefore, that by the end of last century Griesbach had converted almost the whole world to his opinions. Matthaei alone seems to have held to the ancient opinion, and Matthaei was not popular in the west.

In his New Testament published at Riga in 1786 Matthaei had expressed himself very strongly as to the origin of the corruptions in Cod. D. They were due to a Latin monk who knew a moderate amount of Greek, and had made a farrago of readings from other copies and from the fathers and from other parallel passages. It must be owned that this is not very clear. The indictment had too many counts.

In 1808, however, there appeared Middleton's *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, to which was attached a far more close examination of the subject than had yet been made². Middleton had fallen foul of the Codex Bezae in his attempt to apply his theories of the Greek Article to the text of the New Testament: and he subjoins an Appendix, containing some remarks on this Codex.

¹ Vol. 11. pt 2, pp. 676 sqq.

² I use the edition of 1841, published after Middleton's death by H. J. Rose.

This Appendix is really an excellent piece of work, for so small a compass. The writer begins by making a collection of some rare and unique readings in the Codex Bezae in the first twelve chapters of Mark. Then he analyses the variants under eight heads: (1) Synonyms. (2) Transpositions. (3) Compound for Simple and Simple for Compound verbs. (4) Wrong moods and tenses. (5) Alterations in the sense. (6) Questionable Greek. (7) Latinisms. (8) The uses of the Article. Under all these heads Middleton finds evidence of latinizing corruption, and he concludes that "the Cambridge Ms. though a most venerable remain of antiquity, is not to be considered, in a critical view, of much importance. It is of use to the translator and to the dogmatic theologian, but not, as I think, generally speaking, to the editor of the N.T., whose object it is to give a text approaching as nearly as possible to the Autographs." But he adds very fairly "As to the goodness of its readings, considered with regard to the sense, I have already observed that for this fact we may in part account by the natural supposition of the great antiquity of the MS. which was the basis of the Codex Bezae."

In the present century the general opinion as to the excellence of the text underlying Codex D has become more and more decided. It is regarded as an exploded fiction to speak of latinizing, and as a rule the Latin text is only quoted where the Greek is lost, or where there is some peculiarity attaching to it which constitutes a fresh point in the evidence.

Accordingly Dr Hort says "a large proportion of the Latin texts of these MSS. is indeed, beyond all reasonable doubt, unaltered Old Latin; but where they exactly correspond to the Greek, as they do habitually, it is impossible to tell how much of the accordance is original, and how much arbitrary; so that for the criticism of the Greek text the Latin reading has here no independent authority." And his account of the genesis of the bilingual texts is that "a genuine (independent) Old Latin text has been adopted as the basis, but altered throughout into verbal conformity with the Greek text by the side of which it was intended to stand." It will be seen from these quotations how completely the Greek text of Cod. Bezae has come to be regarded

¹ Introduction to N. T. pp. 82, 83.

as independent of the translation which accompanies it. Our question, then, is whether this belief in the independence of the Greek text is well-founded; and it is clear that, if the critics have come to a wrong conclusion on this point, it will not be easy to make progress in the study of the New Testament origins until the error is rectified. We proceed then to examine the question again in the light of the instances of Latinization quoted above, and such others as may be detected.

Now, when we say that there has been action and re-action between the Greek and Latin texts in Codex Bezae, we do not merely mean that a bilingual scribe makes bilingual mistakes. It is quite true and worthy of notice that there are errors by the writing of Greek letters in the Latin words, etc. Thus there are several cases where the letters of one language are used erroneously in the words of the other language. Perhaps the most curious is in Matt. v. 22, where the present text runs thus:

Ego autem dico uobis: quia omnes qui irascitur.

There is reason to believe that in the archetype of the Western texts there once stood pascitur instead of irascitur; the first letter of the last word being lost in the last letter of qui; and the r becoming p by the confusion prevalent in Graeco-Latin palaeography. Our reason for believing this error to be wide spread and original is the fact that it is found at this point in Codex k, which is said to be African Latin: and also in the Latin of Irenaeus, ii. 32, 1, in the Codex Claromontanus. There is no more curious error than this in the whole New Testament; one would have supposed it would hardly have escaped correction by a single copyist; and it seems safe to trace to a common origin MSS. which shew such a feature.

But such instances, while they constitute a striking feature of family likeness in the Codices where they occur, do not prove anything at all with regard to the character of the texts. There is always cross-play in a bilingual Ms.

The same thing must be said of such cases as $\lambda \epsilon \pi \rho \omega \sigma \sigma s$, $\phi \lambda a \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \sigma a s$, $\Sigma a \mu a \rho \iota \tau a \nu \omega \nu$ and the like: these are things such as may belong to any bilingual Codex whatever. They are the natural accidents of the case. We must examine the matter much more closely before we can come to a conclusion.

CHAPTER VII.

CASE OF A LATIN HEXAMETER VERSE CARRIED OVER INTO THE GREEK TEXT OF CODEX BEZAE.

But now let us turn to Lukė xxiii. 53, and examine a notable addition which Codex Bezae here makes to the text. The whole verse reads

......και καθέλων ____ ενετγλίζεν το σωμά του ίης εν σίνδονι και εθήκεν αυτόν εν μνημείω λελατομήμενος και θέντος αυτόν επεθήκε τω μνημείω λείθον ον μογίς είκοςι εκύλιον

ET DEPONENS

INVOLVIT CORPVS IHV IN SINDONE
ET POSVIT EVM IN MONVMENTO
SCVLPTO VBI ADHVC
NEMO POSITVS ET POSITO EO IMPOSVIT
IN MONVMENTO LAPIDEM QVEM VIX VIGINTI
MOVEBANT.

Now concerning this added sentence (και θεντος...εκυλιον) Scrivener remarks acutely that it is "conceived somewhat in the Homeric spirit." Let us examine then whether either in the Greek or Latin the added words shew traces of having once been in metre. Fixing our attention on the added words in the Latin, we see that the words posito eo and in monumento are a repetition from the preceding words posuit eum in monumento. And if we erase them we have left what is certainly meant for a hexameter verse,

Imposuit lapidem quem uix uiginti mouebant,

It is clear, then, that the scribe of Codex Bezae, or, if we prefer it, an ancestor of his, has deliberately incorporated into his text a verse of Latin poetry, which he has then turned into Greek, following closely the order of the Latin verse. The only difficulty lies in the quantity of the last syllable of viginti, which would in Virgil be strictly long: but this objection may be over-ruled, for the poetry of our interpolator may be popular, and in any case we are in a position to point out the ultimate poetical origin from which his verse is derived. In fact, as Scrivener suggested, the origin of the gloss is Homeric, and the stone which covered the entrance to the Lord's tomb has been compared with the great stone which Polyphemus rolls to the mouth of his cave. Of this we are told that it was such a great stone that two and twenty waggons would not be able to stir it: (Odyssey IX. 240)

Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἐπέθηκε θυρεὸν μέγαν ὑψόσ' ἀείρας, "Οβριμον· οὐκ ἃν τόνγε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ' ἄμαξαι 'Εσθλαὶ τετράκυκλοι ἀπ' οὔδεος ὀχλίσσειαν,

with which we may compare IX. 304,

Οὖ γάρ κεν δυνάμεσθα θυράων ὑψηλάων Χερσὶν ἀπώσασθαι λίθον ὄβριμον ὃν προσέθηκεν.

There are other similar comparisons in Homer, when great stones are thrown by Ajax and other warriors in battle; but this passage in the Odyssey is undoubtedly the one from which our writer has derived his gloss. The "twenty" insufficient stonemovers are the equivalent of the twenty-two waggons in Homer; and this of itself makes one suspect that the Codex Bezae has borrowed from a Latin version of the Odyssey, and that the next line to the one which he appropriated began with the word "Plaustra."

Moreover the passage is identified with the story of Polyphemus by the fact that the Evangelic allusion is to a cave closed by a stone, which finds a much more exact parallel in the passage from the Odyssey than any of the other Homeric references to the handling of huge stones.

We might compare by way of illustration the following lines from the Ilias Latina 458—462:

Postquam utrique diu steterant nec uulnera magnus Qua daret infesto Tydides ense uidebat, Saxum ingens, medio quod forte iacebat in agro, Bis seni quod uix iuuenes tellure mouerent, Sustulit et magno conamine misit in hostem;

but while this passage furnishes a very instructive parallel, it is not nearly so close to our text as what would be furnished by the incident in the Odyssey.

If further confirmation of the correctness of our theory as to the source of the Bezan gloss were needed, it might be found in the following considerations. The leading facts of the Gospel History were at a very early period (far earlier than most people suppose) transferred into poetry by using the language of Homer, and translating into this speech the record of the Miracles and Passion of our Lord. These curious patchworks of verses and halfverses of Homer were known by the name of Homeric Centones, 'Ομηροκέντρωνες or 'Ομηρόκεντρα. It is not generally known that these collections have exercised a very great influence over the primitive Christian literature. But such is the case, as I hope at some future time to demonstrate. As far as I know, no attention has been given to the subject, and I only refer to it here in order to point out that, when the Homeric Centonists went to work to write the story of our Lord's burial in Greek Hexameters, they made the very same connexion with Polyphemus as we find in the Codex Bezae. To prove this, we will transcribe a few lines of the Homeric Centones, as found in the Paris edition of the Poetae Graeci Christiani of A.D. 1609.

> Περὶ τῆς ταφῆς. Τορνώσαντο δὲ σῆμα, θεμείλιά τε προβάλοντο. ᾿Αγκὰς δ᾽ ἀλλήλων λαβέτην χερσὶ στιβαρῆσιν

'Αγκὰς δ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην χερσὶ στιβαρῆσιν·
Οἱ δ' ὥσθ' ἡμίονοι κρατερὸν μένος ἀμφιβαλόντες,
 Έλκουσ' ἐξ ὅρεος κατὰ παιπαλόεσσαν ἀταρπὸν
 "Η δόκον, ἠὲ δόρυ μέγα νἤιον, ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς
 Τείρεθ' ὁμοῦ καμάτω τε καὶ ἱδρῷ σπευδόντεσσιν.
 'Ως οι γ' ἐμμεμαῶτε, νέκυν φέρον. αὐτὰρ ὕπερθεν,
 Χερσὶ μέγαν λίθον ἀείραντές τε προσέθηκαν
 "Ομβριμον· οὐκ ἃν τόνδε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ' ἄμαξαι
 'Εσθλαὶ, τετράκυκλοι, ἀπ' οὔδεος ὀχλίσσειαν.

The striking coincidence in the treatment of the case by the Centonist with the gloss in the Bezan text renders it certain that we have referred the latter to its true origin in the pages of Homer. The intermediate link was either some Latin form of the Odyssey, or it was a version of the Gospels made by a Latin Centonist.

Further light is thrown on the subject by the consideration that the same gloss which we have detected in Cod. Bezae is found in one other Latin copy and in one of the Egyptian versions.

The Latin Ms. which is denoted by the sign c (Cod. Colbertinus), whose text will be found in Sabatier's Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae, gives the additional matter in the form

et cum positus esset in monumento, posuerunt lapidem quem uix uiginti uoluebant.

Some changes have here been introduced into the original form; posito eo has been replaced by cum positus esset; inposuit becomes posuerunt; and movebant has been corrected to uoluebant. Now clearly movebant is the original word, for it is coupled, if our suggestion be correct, with plaustru; but since movebant went back into Greek as $\epsilon\kappa\nu\lambda\iota o\nu$, it seems that in Cod. c we have a re-translation from the Greek with greater exactness; and the same supposition explains cum positus esset as a new translation of $\kappa a \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \tau o s$, and posuerunt may be due to a reading $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \theta \nu \kappa a \nu$ in the Greek, or to a desire to avoid the difficulty of the rolling of such a stone by a single man. We suspect then that the text of c is a re-translation of the Western Greek. The other version to which we have alluded is the Sahidic or Thebaic, which gives a reading answering to

cum uero posuissent eum posuit lapidem in porta sepulcri quem uiginti homines uoluere possent.

It is interesting again to observe the changes that have taken place, the explanatory gloss in porta sepulcri, the express introduction of homines after the numeral, the dropping of uix, and the change from movebant to uoluere possent.

The reading, moreover, proves, and it is a fact of immense textual importance, that the Thebaic version ultimately leans, in

part, on a Latin base. It has always been a problem to account for the large Western element in the Thebaic version; we now see in what direction to look for the explanation. It is not, in the present case, a question of early Greek recensions; if the Thebaic version took the gloss in question from a Greek copy, it was from a Greek Ms. which was the *umbra* of a Latin text, and it is even possible that it may have borrowed from the Latin directly.

Further, we may say that the text from which the verse in question was originally taken, whether it be a metrical Gospel or a collection of Latin Centones, or a Latin Odyssey, must have been an early work; for it has every appearance of being older than the common origin of the group of authorities

D + c +theb.

It is commonly held that the Bezan text is a fourth century product; I believe it to be in the main, including the glosses, two hundred years earlier than this; the Thebaic version is usually referred to the third century at least, against which date we know no reason; and it seems, therefore, that the metrical gloss must be very ancient, and this consideration will help us in finding the date, not only of the special corruption which we are studying, but of associated and similarly attested errors.

For example, the reasoning in the preceding paragraph would exclude the possibility of the gloss in question being taken, say, from the Evangelical History of Juveneus.

It is true that Juvencus in his account of the entombment draws upon the Polyphemus passage, as the following extract will shew:

Concessit praeses, et corpus fulgida lino Texta tegunt, saxique nouo componitur antro: Limen concludunt immensa uolumina petrae.

Lib. Iv. 724—726.

Here Juvencus has borrowed 'immensa uolumina' from Virgil, but he seems to have Homer also in his mind, for his verses have a ring very like *Odyssey* IX. 235, and 243.

"Εντοσθεν δ' ἄντροιο βαλών ὀρυμαγδον ἔθηκεν Τόσσην ηλίβατον πέτρην ἐπέθηκε θύρησιν. Juveneus then shews the same tendency to use the language of the Polyphemus story, but he makes no use of the line descriptive of the size of the stone, and, as we have shewn above, this line must belong to an earlier writer.

The question now is, whether we can refer the original gloss to any definite time or person?

My friend Dr McCabe¹, who first pointed out that my Beza hexameter was substantially a verse of the Odyssey, suggested that it might possibly be a fragment from Livius Andronicus. The Odyssey was translated into Latin verse at a very early date indeed, and the translation is, in fact, one of the first efforts at Latin poetry. Livius Andronicus, nearly 250 years before the Christian era, transferred the Odyssey into Saturnian verse: and the translated poem was still used as a school-book in Horace's day. Moreover, when we say that the metre was Saturnian, this is not meant to exclude an occasional hexameter; for these early poets used a good deal of freedom: and, in fact, the fragments of Livius Andronicus which are preserved shew some decided cases of hexameter writing.

Unfortunately, we are not able to test the conjecture in question by means of a direct reference, for by far the major part of the Latin Odyssey is wanting.

Moreover, we shall see bye and bye, that this case of demonstrated Homerization is only one out of a number of such cases occurring in Codex Bezae and other Christian writings that seem to be connected with it. We shall, therefore, leave it for the present an open question who was responsible for the Latin verse injected into the account of the Entombment; if we were forced to make a suggestion, we should say it was due to an early Christian Centonist, probably of the second century.

¹ Of the Seminary of S. Carlo Borromeo, Pennsylvania.

CHAPTER VIII.

TRACES OF AN ATTEMPT AT NUMERICAL VERBAL EQUALITY BETWEEN THE GREEK AND THE LATIN ON THE PART OF THE SCRIBES OF THE ANCESTRY OF CODEX BEZAE.

It is interesting to notice that this reflex action of the Latin on the Greek had been observed by Bentley, who had the Ms. for so many years in his personal keeping at Trinity College. If we turn to Luke xv. 28,

o be thathp bytoy exerbun hpzato byton pater avtem eins exiens rogabat evm,

we shall see that the word παρακαλεῖν has dropped from the end of the Greek line, apparently because there was nothing to balance it in the Latin, which had however rightly translated ἤρξατο παρακαλεῖν, or perhaps a primitive παρεκάλει, by rogabat¹. And Bentley, who noticed this, remarked², "Exciderat τὸ 'παρακαλεῖν' in Graeco; quod in Latino rependit eodem (ut solet) verborum ordine."

No doubt Bentley was right in his explanation, and there are too many such instances for us to regard the omissions as accidental. For example, two pages further on in the Ms., Luke xvi. 16, we have

KAI ΠΑC EIC AYTHN BIAZETAI ET OMNES IN EAM CONATVR,

where it is possible that the translator wrote conatur introire: in this case then the Latin text has been shorn of a word. It is much to be wished that Bentley had followed his clue a little

¹ Rogabat is also found in Cod. e.

² Ellis, Bentleii Critica Sacra, p. 15.

farther into the mysteries of the Beza text: unfortunately, though he was quite alive to the question, he was misled in a passage in the Acts and came to conclude that the Greek had not been corrected to the Latin, and so did not give himself full scope in the perplexing problems offered in his text. We shall find, for instance, that he studied the discrepant Greek and Latin of Acts vi. 14,

katalycei ton totton toyton kai allažei ta $\varepsilon\theta$ h destruet locum istum mutavit iterum,

where mutauit stands for mutabit.

Here Bentley says: " $\check{\epsilon}\theta\eta$ accepit pro eo quod est $\check{\epsilon}\tau\iota$. N.B. non correxisse Graeca ad Latina."

We should take a different view from Bentley: for it seems to us that the translator rendered $\mathring{a}\lambda\lambda\mathring{a}\xi\epsilon\iota$ by mutauit iterum, and $\tau\mathring{a}\ \mathring{e}\theta\eta$, probably, by consuctudines; but having thus allowed the Latin text to gain on the Greek, a word was subtracted, viz. the final one in the sentence. If this explanation be the correct one, it will be seen that Bentley missed a case which exactly confirmed his theory in Luke.

We must certainly examine for other cases of the same kind, and see to what conclusions they lead us with regard to the manner of building and rebuilding of the two texts involved.

Here is another curious specimen of the kind referred to by Bentley:

In Matt. xx. 11,

KATA ΤΟΥ ΟΙΚΟΔΕCΠΟΤΟΥ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕC ADVERSVS FAMILIAM DICENTES,

because patrem familias gave a word in excess.

But it is time to take the matter up more in detail.

Let us examine, then, how far the attempt to make the Greek words and the Latin words numerically and in other respects to agree has operated to affect either the Greek or the Latin tradition of the Ms.

We may be sure that, if such a tendency existed, it would be found in cases where the usage of one language is more elliptical than the other. For example, it may be remembered that Daillé based one of his objections to the genuineness of the Epistle of

Polycarp on the use of the expression "qui cum eo sunt," which seemed to imply that Ignatius was alive after his martyrdom, whereas the expression was in reality only a rather unfortunate translation of $\tau o i s$ $\mu e \tau$ a $i \tau o i$. Now, if a bilingual text of the Epistle of Polycarp had been current, written in the style of the Codex Bezae, and some stupid scribe had attempted to make a numerical equality between the translation and the text, he would have been obliged either to erase the sunt or to introduce a verb, probably $o i \sigma \iota$ or $i \pi \acute{a} \rho \chi o \iota \sigma \iota$, on the Greek side. Now this imaginary case is one which can be readily paralleled from the Codex Bezae: we may begin almost anywhere.

John iv. 9 should read

πως ςγ ιογδαίος ων παρ επογ πειν αιτείς γγναίκος ςαπαρειτίδος ογεής.

But the Latin had rendered it

TV CVM SIS IVDAEVS • QVOMODO A ME
- BIBERE PETIS • MVLIERE SAMARITANAE,

and the word $o\tilde{v}\sigma\eta s$, being now unbalanced, was erased; further, since quomodo has shifted to a part of the sentence remote from $\pi\hat{\omega}s$, the scribe corrects the order of the Greek, and finally we have

cy ιογδαίος ων πως παρ εμογπειν αίτεις γγναίκος ςαμαριτίδος.

For a second instance take Acts xiii. 29,

 $\omega c \ \Delta \varepsilon \ \varepsilon t \varepsilon \lambda o \gamma n$ παντά τα περί αυτού γεγραμμένα είcin.

Here the word $\epsilon l\sigma \nu$ was added, because the Latin had rendered the sentence

ET CONSVMMAVERVNT
OMNIA QVAE DE ILLO SCRIPTA SVNT.

In Matthew v. 12 we should have

oytwc gap $\varepsilon \Delta i \omega \Xi$ an toyc προφητάς τογς προ γμών,

which was rendered

ITA ENIM PERSECUTI SUNT
PROPHETAS • QVI ANTE VOS FVERUNT,

and to balance the added fuerunt the scribe has inserted in the Greek the word $\hat{\nu}\pi\hat{\alpha}\rho\chi o\nu\tau as$.

In Matthew xi. 28 (a case to which Mill drew attention),

δεγτε προς με παντές οι κοπιώντες και πεφορτισμένοι έςται

where the last word $\epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon$ seems to have been derived from the Latin

VENITE AD ME OMNES QVI LAVORATIS ET ONERATI ESTIS.

In Mark v. 40 the Greek

παραλαμβανεί τον πατέρα τος παιδίος και την μητέρα και τούς μετ αυτού

has been rendered

ADSVMPTO PATRE
ET MATRE PVELLAE
ET QVI CVM ILLO ERANT,

and the revising hand has added the equivalent of the word erant to the Greek, and harmonized the order of the words, giving us

kai thn mhtepa toy π ai λ ioy kai toyc met aytoy ontac.

So in Mark ii. 25,

AYTOC KAI OI MET AYTOY ONTEC

because of the Latin

IPSE ET QVI CVM ILLO ERANT.

In Luke xv. 24,

νεκρος ην και ανέζησεν απολώλως και αρτι εγρέθη

the Latin is

MORTVVS ERAT ET REVIXIT PERIERAT ET MODO INVENTVS EST,

where one word is used to translate $\partial \pi \partial \lambda \omega \lambda \hat{\partial} \hat{\eta} \nu$, is the reason for the omission of $\hat{\eta} \nu$ in the Greek of our Codex.

In Luke xxiii. 38,

o Baciλεγς των Ιογδαίων ογτος εςτιν REX IVDAEORVM HIC EST,

where again $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ has been added.

In Mark ii. 4 the original text

και χαλωει τον κραβαττον οπογ ο παραλγτικός κατέκειτο

was translated

ET DIMISERVNT GRABATTVM IN QVO ERAT PARALYTICVS IACENS;

and this rendering of the imperfect tense by means of the auxiliary and the participle is the reason why in our text we find the passage written

> και χαλωςι τον κραβαττον οπογ ην ο παραλγτικός κατακειμένος,

and this $\delta \pi o \nu \tilde{\eta} \nu$ made it further necessary to add in the previous line the words $\delta i \eta \sigma o \hat{\nu}_{\varsigma}$, viz. $\delta \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma a \sigma a \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \nu \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \eta \nu \delta \pi o \nu \tilde{\eta} \nu \delta i \eta \sigma o \hat{\nu}_{\varsigma}$.

In Mark iv. 31,

меткротером естім

ΠάΝΤωΝ ΤωΝ ΟΠΕΡΜΑΤώΝ ΤώΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΟ ΓΗΟ

was rendered

MINOR EST

OMNIBVS SEMINIBVS . QVAE SVNT IN TERRA,

and in consequence of this, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ is replaced in the Codex Bezae by $\ddot{a} \epsilon i \sigma \iota \nu$.

In Mark v. 9.

τι coi onoma και απεκριθη ονομα μοι λεγεών

is a sufficient equivalent to the Latin

QVOD TIBI NOMEN EST • ET RESPONDIT EST MIHI NOMEN LEGIO.

But to make the parallelism more exact, we have the Greek altered to

τι coi onoma εστίν και απεκρίθη εστίν μοι ονομά λεγίων

In Mark vi. 3 the original text

και ογκ είςιν αι αδελφαί αυτου ωδε προς ήμας

would naturally be rendered

NONNE ET SORORES EIVS '

Hence the word $\epsilon l\sigma \nu$ was erased in the first line of the Greek and carried into the second; and further nonne et was replaced by the more exactly equivalent $o\dot{\nu}\chi\dot{\nu}$ $\kappa a\dot{\nu}$.

In Mark vi. 20,

ειλως αγτον ανδρα δικαίο<mark>ν</mark> και αγιον

was rendered

SCIENS EVM VIRVM IVSTVM ET SANCTVM ESSE.

Accordingly eivai has been added after "ayiov in the Greek.

The auxiliary verb would seem to have been also carried into
the Greek in Mark viii. 2: it probably stood at first

OTI HMEPAIC TPICIN TROCMENOYCI MOI.

The Latin translator rendered the first words

QVONIAM IAM TRIDVVM EST;

and paraphrased the last word or words, by saying

EX QVO HIC SVNT;

and then the attempt was made to turn triduum est literally into Greek, giving us $\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\iota$ $\tau\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}s$ $\epsilon\hat{\iota}\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu$; and further ex quo hic sunt has been restored verbatim to the Greek, with the final and fearful result

οτι ηδη ημέραι τρις είςιν από πότε ωδε είςιν.

Very similar treatment will be found in Matt. xv. 32.

In Mark ix. 34 the Greek had

προς αλληλογό γαρ Διελέχθησαν τις Μιζών.

The idiomatic $\tau i s$ $\mu \epsilon i \zeta \omega \nu$ had to be paraphrased, and the Latin shews

QVIS ESSE[T] ILLORVM MAIOR.

Consequently the Greek of Codex Bezae has added two words and reads

TIC MIZWN FENHTAL AYTWN.

In Mark x. 27,

παρα ανθρωποις τούτο αλύνατον

becomes in Latin

APVT HOMINES HOC . IMPOSSIBILE EST,

and so $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ is inserted at the end of the Greek, and the natural ellipticity of the Greek speech gives way before the law of numerical verbal equivalence.

In Mark xiv. 21,

καθως Γεγραπται περι αγτογ

was properly rendered

SICVT SCRIPTVM EST DE ILLO,

but since *scriptum est* is two words, a correction is made to the Greek, and we have

καθως εςτιν Γεγραμμένον περι αγτογ.

In Acts iv. 34 the texts run

ογδε γαρ ενδεής τις υπήρχεν εν αυτοίς οσοί γαρ κτητορές ήςαν χωρίων η οικείων υπήρχον.

NEC ENIM INOSP QVISQVAM ERAT IN EIS QVODQVOD POSSESSORES ERANT PRAEDIORVM AVT DOMVM.

Here we see that $i\pi\hat{\eta}\rho\chi\sigma\nu$ in the third line has been translated by erant in the second Latin line: therefore the scribe has added the word $\hat{\eta}\sigma a\nu$ to the second line of the Greek for the sake of correspondence.

In Acts v. 38 the Latin translator had to deal with

και τα ΝΥΝ αδελφοι λεγω ΥΜείΝ,

so he translated $\tau \hat{\alpha} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ by quae nunc sunt and the necessary $\epsilon i \sigma \iota \nu$ was then carried back into the Greek. Curiously enough, probably because nunc and sunt have a similar appearance, the word sunt slipped from the Latin which actually stands

ET QVAE NVNC FRATRES DICO VOBIS;

but its equivalent stays in the Greek

KAI TA NYN EICIN.....

In Matthew x. 10 we find

а дос уар естім о єргатис тис трофис аутоу,

where $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ has been introduced because the Latin, with very pardonable freedom, has given us

DIGNVS EST ENIM OPERARIVS ESCA SVA.

In Acts xvii. 6,

οτι οι την οικογμένην αναστατωσάντες ογτοι είσιν και ενθάδε παρείσιν,

the translator took $\kappa a \lambda$ as a connective of two sentences, and accordingly translated

QVIA QVI ORBEM TERRAE INQVITAVERVNT HI SVNT ET HOC VENERVNT.

Hence *sunt* has given rise to the word $\epsilon l\sigma \iota \nu$ which we see to be added in the Greek text.

In Acts xxi. 21 we find

ΟΤΙ ΑΠΟCΤΑCΙΑΝ ΔΙΔΑCΚΕΙΟ ΑΠΟ Μωσεως ΤΟΥΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΕθΝΗ ΕΙΟΙΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΥΟ.

QVIA ABSCENSIONEM DOCENS A MOYSEN OVI IN GENTIBYS SVNT IVDAEOS.

This is a very ragged piece of work; docens is for doces; there is no immediate antecedent to qui, but, if we may judge from other texts there probably once stood in the Greek in the second line $\pi \acute{a}\nu\tau a\varsigma$, and in that case omnes would have been at the beginning of the corresponding Latin. Now since, according to his method, the translator rendered $\tau o\dot{\nu}\varsigma$ $\kappa a\tau\dot{a}$ $\tau\dot{a}$ $\ddot{\epsilon}\theta\nu\eta$ by qui in gentibus sunt, we are not surprised to see $\epsilon l\sigma\iota\nu$ thrust into the Greek text; and at the same time the superfluous $\tau\dot{a}$ disappeared.

In Matt. xvii. 2 the auxiliary has been dropped from the Latin, leaving

ET TRANSFIGURATUS IHS CORAM ILLIS.

Hence the Greek

και μεταμορφωθείς ο ίης ενπροσθέν αγτών.

In Matt. xxv. 25,

ειδογ έχεις το con εςςε habes gvod tvvm,

we see that *est* has been removed from the Latin, in the interests of equality.

In Matt. xxv. 41,

TOTE EPI KAI TOIC EZ EYWNYMWN TVNC AIT ET HIS QVI A SINISTRIS,

where sunt has dropped from the Latin.

Cf. xxv. 34, where the same thing occurs

HIS QVI A DEXTRIS EIVS.

Note also in the same verse the dropping of quod before praeparatum est.

In Mark xiv. 36,

ΔΥΝΑΤΑ ΠΆΝΤΑ COI EICIN,

είσιν has been added because of the Latin

POSSIBILIA OMNIA

IBI SVNT.

We should at least have expected $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$.

Luke viii. 25,

ΠΟΥ ECTIN Η ΠΙCΤΙC ΥΜώΝ VBI EST FIDES VESTRA,

where $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ is intrusive from the Latin.

We have shewn then, conclusively, that the auxiliary verb shews the same phenomena of intrusion and extrusion that we should have expected on the hypothesis of Latinization. Let us then examine some other cases where reflex action between Greek and Latin texts is likely to have occurred.

CHAPTER IX.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE INTERACTION OF THE GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS.

1. Confusions due to betacism.

A very cursory glance at our MS. will shew the prevalence of this feature of late Latin phonetics; the confusion between b and v is everywhere: and we have to see whether this has in any degree reacted upon the interpretation of the Latin text and so upon the Greek text from which it is made.

Turn to Luke i, 78,

en oic effeckeyato hmac anatohh eğ yyoyc

IN QVIBVS VISITAVIT NOS ORIENS EX ALTO.

Here the confusion between uisitauit and uisitabit is so natural, that if we adopt the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort and read ἐπισκέψεται, we must say that our Codex has Latinized: and if we do not adopt this reading, we must say that Codices &BL have Latinized: the dilemma is a pretty one, because D is here supported by almost all other non-Latin authorities, the Latin authorities themselves not being counted one way or the other, on account of the prevalence of betacism in the early copies.

In Luke xv. 15, we should have

ET ADHESIT VNI CIVIVM,

but the scribe gives us

ET ADHESIT IBI VNI CIVIVM.

Possibly he wrote an anomalous adhesibit = adhesiuit; and the ibi of the Latin text has been taken from the verb, the confusion being very easy in the Latin capitals.

A pretty betacistic confusion will be found in Luke xiv. 5, where the Latin is

CVIVS EX VOBIS OVIS AVT BOBIS,

where bovis is a Vulgar Latin nominative: here it is clear that ouis is wrong, being either a repetition of uobis or a correction of bovis: if it is a dittograph we may replace some other word: some persons will imagine a confusion with viós which has the same letters; others will read the equivalent of övos. Finally ouis has been taken over into the Greek and has produced the well-known reading

тінос єў умын проватон н воус.

2. Cases where the corrector has troubled himself over the rendering of $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ at the beginning of a sentence, and with the desire to keep the sequence of the words the same in Greek and Latin has carried back $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ into the Greek under the form of $\kappa a \hat{\iota}$.

Acts xiii. 49,

λιεφερετο λε=ΕΤ PROVVLGABATVR,

and the Greek becomes

και Διεφερετο.

Matt. xvii. 24,

KAI $\varepsilon\lambda\theta$ ONTWN AYTWN ET VENIENTIBVS EIS:

where the original was

ελθοντων Δε αγτων.

Mark iv. 36,

και αλλα πλοια

was rendered

ALIAE AVTEM NAVES,

and then the two texts were adjusted,

και αλλα Δε πλοια ET ALIAE AVTEM NAVES,

other corruptions creeping in afterwards, as a reference to the Codex will shew.

In Mark iv. 29,

ΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΠΑΡΑΔΟΙ

was rendered

ET CVM PRODVXERIT,

and the Greek changed to

και όταν παράδοι.

In Mark vi. 21 the corrector's hand is seen in

KAI ΓΈΝΟΜΕΝΗΟ ΔΕ ΗΜΕΡΑΟ ET CVM DIES....

where we should erase $\kappa a \iota$.

In Mark viii. 29 we should read

και αγτος επηρωτά αγτογο,

but Codex Bezae has

aytoc $\Delta \varepsilon$

on account of the Latin

IPSE AVTEM INTERROGAVIT EOS.

In Luke xix. 39,

TINEC Δε TWN ΦΑΡΙCΑΙWN QVIDEM AVTEM DE PHARISAEIS,

the original text seems to have been

KAI TINEC.....

These are a few instances of a widespread confusion.

3. Cases where the artificial rendering of the article by *ille*, *iste* and *hic* has produced an addition of demonstrative pronouns in the Greek text.

In Matt. xv. 24,

єї мн єїс та провата

seems to have been rendered

NISI AD HAS OVES,

and then we get the harmonized bilingual text

EI MH EIC ΤΑ ΠΡΟΒΑΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ
NISI AD OVES HAS.

Matt. xv. 32,

EIΠEN CΠλαΝΧΝΙΖΟΜΑΙ EΠΙ ΤΟΝ ΟΧΛΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ DIXIT MISEREOR • SVPER TVRBAM HANC,

is another case of the same kind.

There are many other cases of similar textual amplification: and great confusion introduced into the texts thereby: we will give one striking specimen in order to shew how early this mode of rendering is in the history of the Latin text.

In the Gospel of John we frequently find hic mundus used as a translation of $\delta \kappa \delta \sigma \mu o \varsigma$.

Suppose then that we find in John xvii. 11

KAI OYKETI EIMI EN TOYTW TW KOCMW ET IAM NON SVM IN HOC MVNDO,

we reasonably conclude that the $\tau o \acute{\nu} \tau \phi$ came in to balance hoc. Let us then examine the whole passage:

και ογκετι είμι εν τογτω τω κοςμω και ογτοι εν τω κοςμω είςιν καγω προς σε ερχομαι ογκετι είμι εν τω κοςμω και εν τω κοςμω είμι,

for which the Latin is

ET IAM NON SVM IN HOC MVNDO
ET IPSI IN HOC MVNDO SVNT
ET EGO AD TE VENIO IAM NON SVM IN
MVNDO ET IN MVNDO SVM.

It is clear that we have here a conflate text of a similar character to that which we find in Codex Vercellensis (=a), which reads

et hi in hoc mundo sunt, et ego ad te uenio et iam non sum in hoc mundo et in hoc mundo sunt.

Moreover this Codex tells us that the Beza scribe has confounded *sunt* with *sum* at the end of the verse: and we see that the Greek text has not merely preserved the transferred demonstratives, but has followed the Latin in giving $\epsilon i\mu i$ at the end of the verse for $\epsilon i\sigma i\nu$. It is easy now to separate the two parts of the

conflated text and to reject the part which depends upon the false translation of the article. The two parts may be placed side by side:

et iam non sum in hoc mundo = iam non sum in mundo et ipsi in hoc mundo sunt = et in mundo sunt et ego ad te uenio.

This example is very convincing: it tells us moreover that there is a close relation between the Latin texts Cod. a and Cod. d: this point must be noted for future use.

Other cases of hic mundus will be found in viii. 26,

HAEC LOQVOR IN HOC MVNDO.

xiv. 22,

OSTENDERE TE IPSVM ET NON HVIC MVNDO.

xiv. 30,

LOQVAR VOBISCYM VENIT ENIM HVIVS MVNDI PRINCEPS,

where the Greek is

λαληςω μεθ μμων ερχεται γαρ ο τογ κοςμογ αρχών.

xvi. 21,

HOMO IN HVNC MVNDVM,

but in none of these cases has the strong translation of the article affected the Greek. In all of them, however, the Latin agrees with Cod. a.

In John xvii. 14, 15, we have, however, a good case of confusion and reflex action.

και ο κοςμός μείσει αυτούς ότι ούκ είςιν εκ τούτου του κόςμου ούκ ερωτώ ίνα αρμό αυτούς εκ του κόςμου αλλ ίνα τηρήσης αυτούς εκ του πονήρου εκ τούτου του κόςμου ούκ είςιν κάθως κάγω ούκ είμι εκ του κόςμου

the Latin being

ET MVNDVS ODIT EOS QVONIAM NON SVM
DE HOC MVNDO NON ROGO VT TOLLAS
EOS DE MVNDO SED VT SERVES
EOS DE INIQVO DE HOC MVNDO
NON SVNT SICVT ET EGO NON SVM DE MVNDO.

Here we notice first that the translator having used the form odit (instead of odio habuit) which has a present meaning, $\mu\iota\sigma\epsilon\hat{\imath}$ has replaced $\epsilon\mu\iota\sigma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ in the Greek text. Next we see that the Latin scribe has again given sum as an equivalent for sunt: and this repeated error may indicate a dialectical equality of the two forms (cf. the Italian sono which is the equivalent of both sum and sunt). In this case, however, the Greek has not been harmonized with the Latin as it was in John xvii. 11. Third, we see that hoc [mundo] has crept back into the Greek at two separate points; and in both cases there is Latin support for d.

For further reflex actions see xvii. 18, where there are two in a single verse. But perhaps the thing reaches the height of absurdity in xvii. 25, where $\delta \kappa \delta \sigma \mu o_5$ has been translated as mundus hic, and the Greek text appears as

о космос тоутос.

It appears probable then that the primitive Latin translation of John had *hic mundus* everywhere, and Cod. a agrees very well with this idea.

Many other cases of the same confusion, arising from the translation of the article, may be found scattered through the Western text; as Mark viii. 2,

CπλαχΝΙΖΟΜΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΟΧΛΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ MISEREOR SUPER ISTAM TVRBAM,

where $istam = \tau o\hat{v}$, but has been turned back into Greek as $\tau o \dot{v} \tau o v$.

Acts vi. 5,

KAI HPECEN O AOFOC OYTOC ENAMION MANTOC ET PLACVIT SERMO HIC IN CONSPECTU OMNI,

where οὖτος comes from the translation of δ λόγος by hic sermo.

We must not be surprised at this peculiar feature of the primitive Latin translation, for it can be paralleled in the English renderings of the New Testament, being found freely in the Genevan edition of 1576 (Tomson's New Testament). Of this Westcott says¹, "One peculiarity is characteristic of Tomson alone.

¹ Hist. Eng. Bible, p. 232 note.

In his anxiety to express the emphatic force of the Greek Article he constantly renders it by 'that' or 'this,' and in many cases the effect is almost grotesque. One example will suffice 'He that hath that Son hath that life; and he that hath not that Son of God hath not that life' (1 John v. 12)." If Tomson had only lived in the second century, what a splendid chance he would have had for propagating a New Testament with extra-canonical readings!

4. Ambiguities arising from the doubtful gender of such words as eius illius, etc.

In Matt. ix. 26, the original Western Greek was probably

και εξηλθέν η φημή αγτης,

and the Latin of Codex Bezae is

ET EXIIT FAMA EIVS.

But the revising scribe not unnaturally takes eius as masculine and therefore he corrects $a\vec{v}\tau\hat{\eta}\varsigma$ to $a\vec{v}\tau o\hat{v}$, as we have it in the Greek of our text.

I am inclined to believe that it is to the same cause that we must refer the confusion in Matt. xiv. 6. We start from a primitive text

ωρχης ατο η θυγατήρ της ηρωδιαδός,

which was rendered

SALTAVIT FILIA EIVS HERODIADIS.

where eius is meant for a feminine and is the equivalent of the article.

Then we get the Greek altered to $a\vec{v}\tau o\hat{v}$ which necessitates a further correction, and finally we reach the impossible

ωρχης το η θυγατηρ αυτού ηρωδίας.

In Luke ii. 22, we have

KAI ΟΤΕ ΕΠΆΗCΘΗCAN AI ΗΜΕΡΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΘΑΡΙCΜΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΝ NOMON ET CVM CONSVMMATI SVNT DIES PVRGATIONIS EIVS SECVNDVM LEGEM.

Does not eius here stand for $a\vec{v}\tau\hat{\eta}\varsigma$ (the Blessed Virgin), and has it not been understood of our Lord: unless indeed it should turn out

that both readings $a\vec{v}\tau\hat{o}\hat{v}$ and $a\vec{v}\tau\hat{\eta}$ s are derived from a primitive $a\vec{v}\tau\hat{\omega}v$?

5. Curious case of confusion between $o\vec{v}$ and $o\vec{v}$. In Matt. xviii. 20 the translator began to render

OY ΓΑΡ EICI · ΔΥΟ Η ΤΡΕΙΟ CYNHΓΜΕΝΟΙ NON ENIM SVNT DVO AVT TRES · COLLECTI,

and having rendered ov by the negative he was obliged to alter the line

EKEI EIMI EN MECW AYTWN

so that it read

APVT QVOS NON ERO IN MEDIO EORVM.

Hence the Greek

ογκ είζιν γαρ δύο η τρείς αννηγμένοι είς το έμον ονόμα παρ οις ούκ είμει εν μέςω αυτών.

6. Confusion owing to the difference of genders in Greek and Latin.

Matt. iii. 16 we have the Latin

ET VIDIT SPIRITVM DEI DESCENDENTEM DE CAEĻO.

All of the Greek that is preserved is the words

KATABAINONTA EK TOY OYPANOY,

and it would seem that the change from $\kappa a \tau a \beta a \hat{\imath} v o v$, which should accompany $\pi v \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu a$, was due to the Latin descendentem. This suggestion was made by Mill.

In Mark iv. 36 we have

KAI AAAAI $\Delta\varepsilon$ TIAOIAI TIOAAAI• HCAN MET AYTOY
ET ALIAE AVTEM
NAVES MYLTAE• ERANT CVM ILLO,

where we should read ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν.

In Mark ix. 36,

KAI λΑΒωΝ ΤΟ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΝ ECTHCEN AYTON EN MECW AYTWN ET ACCIPIENS PVERVM STATVIT ILLVM IN MEDIO EORVM. Here illum has affected the Greek, and given us $a\vec{v}\tau\acute{o}\nu$ for $a\vec{v}\tau\acute{o}$.

In Acts v. 32 we have a case like the one quoted above from Matt, iii, 16,

KAI TO TINA TO AFION ON EAWKEN O $\overline{\theta c}$ ET SPM SANCTVM QVEM DEDIT DS.

7. Instances where the corresponding verbs or prepositions govern different cases in Latin and Greek:

In Acts xi. 7,

KAI HKOYCA Φωνην λεγογίαν ΜΟΙ ET AVDIVI VOCEM DICENTEM MIHI.

The Latin accusative has been carried over and has replaced the Greek genetive.

Matt. v. 42,

kai t ω θελοντί δανιζάςθαι μη αποστραφής et volenti mytvari ne avertaris,

The Greek has altered $\tau \dot{o} \nu \ \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda o \nu \tau a$ in order to agree more closely with *volenti*.

Matt. ix. 24,

KAI KATEΓΕλώΝ AYTON ET DERIDEBANT EVM,

where we should have av τοῦ in the Greek.

Matt. ix. 25,

EKPATHCEN

THN KEIPA AYTHO

TENVIT

MANVM EIVS,

where we ought to read $\tau \hat{\eta} \hat{s} \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \delta \hat{s}$.

Matt. ix. 38 we have a similar case

 Δ εήθητε ουν τον κν του θερισμού οπατε ergo dnm messis.

John x. 27,

τα προβατά τα εμά της φωνής μου ακούει ονές quae sunt μέσε vocis μέσε αυρίνητ.

Here the Latin has been made to agree with the Greek.

John xii. 47 is a similar case,

ET SI QVIS AVDIERIT MEORVM BERBORVM.

Mark v. 41,

KAI KPATHCAC THN χείρα ΤΟΥ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΥ ET TENENS MANVM PVELLAE,

Mark viii. 23,

και λαβομένος την χειρά του τυφλού Et adpraehendi[t] manym caeci,

where we should read $\tau \hat{\eta}_{S} \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \delta_{S}$.

Mark x. 21,

єм сої ўстереї

instead of

ем се ўстереі

because the Latin is

VNVM TIBI DEEST.

Luke xx. 26,

ογκ εισχήσαν δε αυτού phma επιλαβεσθαι NON POTVERVNT AVTEM EIVS VERBVM ADPRAEHENDERE,

where we should expect ρήματος.

Acts iii. 25 also belongs to this class:

KAI THE Δ IA θ HKHE HN O $\overline{\theta}$ E Δ IE θ ETO
ET EIVS DISPOSITIONIS QVAM \overline{D} S DISPVTAVIT,

where $\hat{\eta}_{\nu}$ is for $\hat{\eta}_{S}$ under the influence of the Latin.

Acts v. 3 may perhaps be mentioned here: it should stand

ΕΙΠΈΝ ΔΕ ΠΈΤΡΟς ΑΝΑΝΙΑ

But *avavia* has been taken as a dative and rendered

Then the Greek is reformed to

είπεν δε πέτρος προς ανανίαν.

Acts vi. 2.

ογκ αρέςτου έςτιν ημέιν καταλείψαντας του λόγου του θυ

NON ENIM PLACET NOBIS DERELICTO VERBO DI,

where $\eta \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ stands for $\eta \mu \hat{a}_{S}$.

8. Cases of confusion between the degrees of comparison of the adjectives; as, for example, where the scribe has, from a correct Semitic feeling, as it would seem, in harmony with Vulgar Latin usage, translated a positive adjective by a comparative or superlative.

Matt. x. 42,

KAI OC AN MOTEICH • ENA TWN EXAXICTWN TOYTWN ET QVICVMQVE POTAVERIT • VNVM DE MINIMIS HIS.

The Latin is a translation of $\mu\iota\kappa\rho\hat{\omega}\nu$, and would be a very good translation if the equivalent of oi $\mu\iota\kappa\rho oi$ had been given in Hebrew or Aramaic, but, in any case, is not a bad rendering. When the translation was thus made, I take it that the reviser wrote $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi i\sigma\tau\omega\nu$ in the Greek.

Probably the same reaction explains why in Matt. xiii. 48, the line

CYNEXEZAN TA KANA EIC TA AFFIA

has been turned into

CYNEλεξαΝ τα καλλιστα...

There is good ground for believing that the Vulgar Latin superlative was often found, as in the Semitic languages, in the form of a repeated positive, so that we suspect that $\tau \hat{a}$ $\kappa \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ of our text is the equivalent of a primitive Latin bona bona, which in Cod. Bezae's Latin has been replaced by meliora, but in Codd. $a \ b \ e \ k$ appears as optima. Whether then $\kappa a \lambda \hat{a}$ or $\kappa \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ is the original reading, the change from one to the other is made through the mediation of the Latin.

¹ Cf. Sanday in Old Latin Biblical Texts, H. p. lxvi.

9. Translation of the Greek agrist by the Latin perfect or imperfect; and examination of the effect of such translations of one tense by another in the original Greek.

In Matt. xvii. 5 we find,

ιδογ νεφελή φωτείνη επεςκιάζεν αγτούς

the Latin being

ECCE NVBS LVCIDA OBVMBRABAT EOS,

for a primitive Greek $\epsilon m \epsilon \sigma \kappa l a \sigma \epsilon \nu$, the aorist having been rendered by the Latin imperfect.

Matt. xix. 27,

KAI ΗΚΟΛΟΥΘΗΚΑΜΈΝ COI ET SECVTI SVMVS TE,

for a primitive $\eta \kappa o \lambda o v \theta \eta \sigma a \mu \epsilon v$ which was translated rightly by a Latin perfect.

In Mark i. 38,

εις τογτο γαρ εξεληλήθα

(where we should perhaps restore єžнавом) because the Latin had rendered the agrist by

AD HOC ENIM VENI.

Mark v. 24,

και απηλθέν μετ αγτογ

becomes

και Υπηγέν Μετ αγτογ

because the Latin was

ET IBAT CVM ILLO.

Mark xv. 14,

οι δε εκπερισσως εκράξαν

becomes ἔκραζον under the influence of

AD ILLI MAGIS CLAMABANT.

Luke viii. 27,

OC EIMATION ΟΥΚ ΕΝΕΔΥΔΙCΚΕΤΟ QVI TVNICAM NON INDVEBATVR,

where we should expect $\partial \nu \epsilon \delta \dot{\nu} \sigma a \tau o$, if the most ancient texts are to be followed, and certainly the translation would be made by an imperfect tense.

Acts vii. 34.

KAI TOY CTENAFMOY AYTOY AKHKOA ET GEMITVS EIVS AVDIVI,

where we should have ηκουσα.

Mark x. 13 seems to have originally been read,

οι δε μαθηται αγτογ επετιμήςαν

DISCIPVLI AVTEM EIVS

and then ἐπετίμησαν had to be corrected to ἐπετίμων.

10. Translation of the Greek agrist by a pluperfect; and other mutations of tenses.

Matt. xi. 21,

OTI EI EN TYPW KAI CIΔWNEI • EFEFONEICAN AI ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙΟ

QVIA SI IN TYRO ET SIDONA • FACTAE ESSENT VIRTYTES.

Here factae essent stands for $\epsilon \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \nu o \nu \tau o$, rightly enough; and hence the correction of the Greek text.

Matt. xvi. 26, the translator rendered

τι γαρ ωφελης εται ανθρωπος

by

QVID AVTEM PRODEST HOMINI,

and hence we get the Greek corrected to ωφελείται.

John xvii. 14,

KAI O KOCMOC MEICEI AYTOYC,

because the Latin rendered the verb $\dot{\epsilon}\mu i\sigma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ by

ET MVNDVS ODIT EOS.

Mark vi. 39,

ανακλιθηναι παντάς

has been rendered

VT DISCYMBERENT OMNES,

and the passive verb in the Greek has been corrected to

In Matt. iv. 8,

παλίν παραλαμβάνει αυτόν ο διαβολός είς όρος υψηλον λείαν και εδείζεν αυτώ.

In the last line the Latin renders

IN MONTEM ALTVM NIMIS ET OSTENDIT EI:

ostendit is both a present and a perfect; but it looks as if some corrector of a Western Ms. had taken it, in this case wrongly, for a perfect and had given us $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\xi\epsilon\nu$ in place of the ordinary reading $\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\nu\sigma\iota\nu$. This explanation was suggested by Middleton in his work on the Greek Article.

11. Rendering of the participle (especially the aorist participle) followed by the verb as two verbs with a conjunction; and consideration of the effect of the same.

Matt. iv. 3 should read

και προσελθων [αγτω] ο πείραζων είπεν αγτω.

To render this into Latin we should say

ET ACCESSIT AD EVM TEMPTATOR ET DIXIT EL.

The translator, in fact, gives us this, only he renders $\delta \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega \nu$ by $qui \ temptabat$.

Is it any wonder that the Greek in Codex Bezae should run

και προσηλθέν αγτω ο πειραζων και είπεν αγτω?

Matt. ix. 28, we should expect a Greek text

ελθοντι δε εις την οικιαν προςηλθον αγτω,

which would become in Latin, as in Cod. D,

ET VENIT IN DOMVM
ET ACCESSERVNT AD EVM.

which rendering reacts and produces

και ερχεται εις την οικίαν και προςηλθον αγτω.....

Matt. xiii. 4,

και ελθοντα τα πετείνα κατεφάρεν αγτα has been made into

και Ηλθον τα πετείνα και κατεφάζεν αγτά

under the influence of

ET VENERVNT VOLVCRES ET COMEDERVNT EA.

Matt. xvii. 7.

kai hyato aytwn kai ei π en et tetigit eos et dixit,

where we should have read

και αψαμένος αγτών είπεν.

Matt. xx. 30,

ηκογεάν ότι της παράγει και εκράξαν λεγοντές

AVDIERVNT QVOD HS TRANSIT ET CLAMAVERVNT DICENTES,

where the primitive Greek would seem to have been ἀκούσαντες... (-καὶ).

Matt. xxi. 6,

ETTOIHCAN.....KAI HEAFON

for

TTOIHCANTEC.....HFAFON

because of the Latin

FECERVNT.....ET ADDVXERVNT.

Matt. xxvi. 51,

και επατάξεν τον Δογλον

τογ αρχιερεως και αφειλεν.....

because of the Latin

ET PERCVSSIT SERVVM

PRINCIPES SACERDOTIS ET ABSTVLIT.....

John vi. 11,

και εγχαριστήσεν και εδωκέν

for

εγχαριστήσας διέδωκεν.

Sometimes a reviser has taken pains to restore the participial construction in the Latin: e.g. in

John xii. 3,

ERGO MARIA ACCIPIENS LIBRAM PISTICI VNGVENTI PRETIOSI ET VNXIT PEDES, Here it is clear that he had at first accipit or accepit to correspond to the Greek $\lambda \alpha \beta o \hat{v} \sigma a$; first, because he has left the et in the second line: and next, because $\lambda \alpha \beta o \hat{v} \sigma a$ has been changed to $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \hat{a} \nu \epsilon \iota$ in the Greek.

John xii. 36,

και απελθων εκργβΗ απ αγτων

becomes

και απηλθέν και εκρίβη απ αγτών

under the influence of the Latin

ET ABIIT ET ABSCONDIT SE AB EIS.

Acts xiv. 6,

CYNIΔONTEC KAI KATEΦYFON INTELLEXERVNT ET FVGERVNT,

where $\kappa a i$ is from the Latin.

Luke v. 14,

ΑΠΕΛΘΕ ΔΕ

ΚΑΙ ΔΕΙΖΌΝ CEAYTON

VADE AVTEM

ET OSTENDE TEIPSVM.

Here the Greek should be ἀλλὰ ἀπελθών δείξον.

Luke xv. 23,

και φαρωμέν και εγφρανθωμέν ET MANDVCEMVS ET AEPVLEMVR,

where we should have $\phi a \gamma \acute{o} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \epsilon \mathring{v} \phi \rho a \nu \theta \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$.

In Mark iv. 36 for

και αφεντές τον οχλον παραλαμβανογείν αγτον the translator has

ET DIMITTVNT TVRBAM \cdot ET ACCEPERVNT EVM,

whence the Greek becomes

και αφιογείν τον οχλον • και παραλαμβανογείν αγτον.

In Mark vii. 25,

ελθογοα και προσεπεσεν

stands against

INTRAVIT ET PROCEDIT.

Obviously the $\kappa a i$ is an intrusion from the Latin.

In Mark x. 16.

ετιθεί τας χείρας επ αγτα και εγλογεί αγτα

for κατευλόγει τιθείς, because the Latin was

IMPONEBAT MANVS SVPER ILLOS ET BENEDICEBAT EOS.

In Mark x. 22,

ο δε εστηγνασέν επι τούτω τω λόγω και απηλθέν αd ille contristatus

IN HOC VERBO • ET ABIIT.

The Greek should be $\sigma \tau \nu \gamma \nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma a_S \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$: observe that est has been removed from the Latin after contristatus in the interests of equality.

In Mark xi. 2 again the change of the Greek is only partial; kal has been introduced, but the participle left:

AYCANTEC AYTON KAI AFAFETE SOLVITE ILLUM ET ADDUCITE.

So in Mark xiv. 63,

λιαρρήξας τους χειτώνας αυτού και λεγεί scidit vestimenta sva et ait,

and Mark xvi. 14,

πορεγθεντές εις τον κος Μον και κηργξατε το εγαργελίον.

12. Cases where the Latin has used two verbs to render a single Greek verb, and a corrector has either erased one of the Latin verbs, or has carried over an extra verb into the Greek.

In Mark v. 18

παρεκαλει αγτον ο Δαιμονισθείς

is translated line by line,

COEPIT DEPRAECARI ILLVM QVI DEMONIO VEXABATVR,

the imperfect being given as an inchoative. The Greek has then been brought into harmony with it: and so we have in Cod. Bezae

нр зато паракале и аутом.

Exactly the same corruption occurs in Mark viii. 25, where

και ΔιεβλεψεΝ

has been made into

και μρέατο αναβλεψαι

because the Latin translation was

ET COEPIT VIDERE.

Probably the same thing occurs in Mark xiv. 72,

και επιβαλων εκλαιεν.

Whatever $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta a \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ may mean, the Latin is

ET COEPIT FLERE,

which translates $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda a\iota\epsilon\nu$. Was $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta a\lambda\omega\nu$ then displaced by $\tilde{\eta}\rho\xi a\tau o$? For we find in Cod. Bezae

και μρέατο κλαιείν.

In the Acts of the Apostles there are a number of cases where the simple $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota$ and $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu$ of Greek narration has been expanded in this way: or where $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota$ has been added to a similar word.

Acts xvii. 6,

Boωntec και λεγοντες clamantes et dicentes,

where the proper Greek text is merely $\beta o\hat{\omega}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$.

Acts xvii. 19,

HΓΑΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΌΝ ΕΠΙ ΑΡΙΌΝ ΠΑΓΟΝ ΠΥΝθΑΝΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕC ADDVXERVNT AD ARIVM PAGVM COGITANTES ET DICENTES.

In the last line *cogitantes* is an error for *rogitantes*; and this free double rendering of the Greek $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ has led to the insertion of the words $\pi \nu \nu \theta a \nu \acute{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu \iota \iota$ in the Greek.

In Acts xxi. 39

Δαιομέ δε σου συνχωρησαι μοι

is rendered

ROGO OBSEGRO AVTEM MIHI.

Here $\delta a \iota o \mu \epsilon$ is by itacism for $\delta \epsilon o \mu a \iota$, and $\delta \epsilon o \mu a \iota$ $\delta \epsilon$ $\sigma o \nu$ is rendered freely enough, but not unfairly, by rogo obsecto. The

reviser of the text, finding these two verbs instead of one, struck out by mistake the word which the translator had used to render $\sigma v \nu \chi \omega \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$.

What we have said of the double translation of verbs applies also to those cases where two words were necessary to render a noun.

Here is a striking instance: in Luke xxii, 12, the translator had to render the word ἀνώγαιον; he employed a word, which was understood in the Vulgar Latin of the provinces, and especially, it would seem, in Africa, viz. maenianum, a word which means an overhanging balcony. The word does not, however, occur in its true form in any of the great Latin Codices, but in the Codex Vercellensis (a) it appears in the form medianum both in Mark xiv. 15, and in Luke xxii. 12. This medianum. of course, caused trouble, and in the passage from Luke we find Cod. Veronensis (b) gives us pede plano (on the ground floor), which is a blundering correction of medianum as we have it in a. This necessitated the addition of an explanatory word to shew what it was that was to be found on the ground floor, and hence many Latin texts add locum, and then afterwards the scribes go back and correct the 'ground floor' to in superioribus = 'upstairs.

Now let us turn to Codex Bezae, where we find a bold correction; medianum is replaced by superiorem domum. We have now two Latin words for one Greek word, so the scribe quietly inserts οἰκον after ἀνώγαιον.

We have given this instance at length, on account of the peculiarly interesting ramification of the Latin texts over a hard word. The special case of the change in the Greek in Cod. D is very simple and easily betrays itself. We shall have many similar cases as we proceed.

13. Cases where the agrist participle or agrist imperative has been rendered by the Latin present participle or present imperative; and subsequent reflex action on the Greek.

¹ For maenianum cf. Linke, Studien zur Itala, Breslau, 1889, p. 28. The parallel passage Mark xiv. 15 is instructive in its various forms in the Old Latin. In particular Codex Bezae has here ἀναγαιον οἰκον ἐστρωμενον μεγαν ἐτοιμον although both medianum and superiorem locum have disappeared from the Latin.

Acts xiv. 21,

εγαργελιζομένοι δε τογό εν τη πολεί

has been made out of

εγαργελισαμένοι......

because the Latin translator had, of necessity, unless he had resorted to the use of the finite verb, rendered by

EVANGELIZANTES AVTEM IN ILLA CIVITATE.

In Acts xvi. 29 I believe a similar error once occurred in Western copies:

φωτα δε ετης εισεπηδής εν,

the translator gives

LVMEN VERO PETENS ACCVCVRRIT.

If this *petens* had changed $ai\tau\eta\sigma as$ of the Greek into $ai\tau\omega\nu$, it would easily have been read $a\pi\tau\omega\nu$, which underlies the Syriac rendering; and in some respects seems to be a superior reading.

Matt. x. 27,

khpyccetai eti twn Δ wmatwn praedicate in tectis,

where we ought to have, not κηρύσσετε but κηρύξατε.

Matt. xiii. 22,

o $\Delta\varepsilon$ eic tac akanhac cheipomenoc QVI avtem in spinis seminatur,

the word $\sigma\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon$ in the first line having been replaced by one more exactly correspondent to the Latin.

In the same way in Matt. xiii. 24, σπείραντι, which was translated *seminanti*, has given way before the Latin, and we have

an θ p ω π ω cheiponti • ka λ on chepma homini seminanti bonvm semen.

Luke ii. 16,

CΠΕΥΔΟΝΤΈC KAI EYPON THN MAPIAN FESTINANTES ET INVENERVNT MARIAM.

Here festinantes stands for $\sigma \pi \epsilon \dot{\nu} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ and the Greek has been assimilated to the translation.

Luke ii. 45,

KAI MH EYPICKONTEC YTECTPEWAN
ET NON INVENIENTES REVERSI SYNT.

Here $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho i \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ stands for $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho \dot{o} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, which of necessity was represented by the present participle in the Latin.

In Luke xix. 27 we find a similar difficulty with the infinitive:

τογς ΜΗ ΘελοΝΤΑς ΜΕ

BACINEYEIN

QVI NOLVERVNT ME

REGNARE.

Here we should have expected $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$: but the reason for the change is not far to seek.

So again in Luke xx. 6, the Latin having given

SCIT ENIM

IOHANNEN PROPHETAM FVISSE,

where the Greek had $\epsilon i \nu a \iota$, the corrector has given us $\gamma \epsilon \gamma o \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \iota$ as a more exact answer to fuisse.

Luke xxii. 9,

εισερχομένων

YMON EIC THN TTOXIN

for $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ because the Latin is

INTROEVNTIBVS

VOBIS IN CIVITATEM.

14. Confusion caused by the attempt to translate the articular infinitive in Greek.

We may take as an instance Mark xiv. 55,

EIC TO BANATWCAI AYTON,

which was rightly rendered

VT MORTI TRADERENT EVM.

after which it goes back into Greek as

"NA θαΝΑΤωςογςΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ.

In Acts iii. 12 we have the following confusion

ως ημών τη ιδία δύναμι η εύςεβια τούτο πεποιηκότων του το περιπατείν αυτό QVASI NOS NOSTRA PROPRIA VIRTUTE AUT PIETATE HOC FECERIMUS UT AMBULET HIC. In order to resolve the confusion, observe that in iii. 19 the articular infinitive is rendered by the equation $\epsilon i s$ $\tau \delta = ad$ hoc ut. Hence in the present case we have $\tau o \hat{v}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon \hat{\iota} v$ rendered by hoc ut ambulet.

Then the words are displaced, and the Greek is corrected until we get the Bezan sentence.

Acts iii. 26,

εν τ απος

ΤΡΕΦΕΊΝ ΕΚΑCTOC ΕΚ ΤωΝ ΠΟΝΗΡΙώΝ ΥΜώΝ IN EO CVM ABERTATUR VNVSQVISQVE A NEQVITIIS SVIS,

the Greek ἕκαστον has been changed so as to match the Latin unusquisque.

With this error take the similar one, Acts xviii. 2,

ΔΙΑ ΤΟ ΤΕΤΑΧΈΝΑΙ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΌ ΕΟ QVOD PRAECEPISSET CLAVDIVS.

15. Translation of the subjunctive after $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$.

This very strong form of denial is rendered in the Latin by a future indicative: hence we shall find the subjunctive in Greek replaced by an indicative: e.g.

Mark x. 15,

OY MH EIC AYTHN EICENEYCETAI NON INTRAVIT IN ILLVM.

16. Translation of a Greek infinitive by ut with the subjunctive: and converse case of a Latin infinitive for $\delta\tau\iota$ with the indicative.

Mark v. 17,

και παρεκαλογη αγτοη της απελθή

ET ROGABANT EVM
VT DISCEDERET,

where we should read $\partial \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, if it were not for the Latin. Mark vi. 49 the original text seems to be

ελοξαν οτι φαντάς κα εςτιν,

and the Bezan Latin is

PVTAVERVNT FANTASMA ESSE.

Hence the Bezan Greek

εδοξαν φαντάς και είναι.

17. Changes of compound verbs to simple, and conversely, with a view to greater harmony between Greek and Latin.

Matt. ix. 25,

ελθων εκρατής εν Veniens tenvit.

There is reason to believe the true reading to be $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} v$, but the translator rendered it by *veniens*, and a reviser erased the Greek prefix.

Matt. x. 25,

BELZEBUL VOCANT,

where we ought to read ἐπεκάλεσαν.

Matt. xvi. 23,

ο δε επιστραφεία είπεν τω πετρώ,

where we should have στραφείς, the Latin being

QVI AVTEM CONVERSVS AIT PETRO.

John iv. 45,

 $\varepsilon \tilde{z} \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{z}$ anto ayton oi faxidaioi excepervnt evm galilaei,

the simple form $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\dot{\epsilon}\xi a\nu\tau o$ being not close enough in appearance to its Latin rendering.

18. Confusion of the Vulgar Latin present with the future in the third person singular.

In John xii. 25 we should read

ο φιλων την ψυχην απολλύει αυτήν

for which the Latin is

QVI AMAT ANIMAM SVAM PERDET EAM.

Here perdet is a late form of the present tense; but it has the form of the Latin future: so we get $\partial \pi o \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ written in the Greek.

This confusion between the *e* and *i* vowels is very common both in the verb-endings and in the plurals of nouns, and has given rise to many variants in the Latin and by reflection from the Latin text to the Greek. For instance in John vi. 56

O ΤΡωΓωΝ ΜΟΥ ΤΗΝ CAPKA · KAI ΠΕΊΝωΝ ΜΟΥ ΤΟ AIMA · EN EMOI MENEI QVI EDET MEAM CARNEM ET VIBET MEVM SANGVEM IN ME MANET

we have an apparent future in the Latin twice, and in Mark xiv. 21

o men yioc toy an θ pw π oy π apa Δ i Δ ote filivs qvidem hominis tradetur.

But here there has been no reaction upon the Greek.

19. Confusion between the two meanings of quam.

The reviser of the Ms. had a prejudice in favour of regarding quam as a feminine form. Hence we find, Matt. xi. 22,

anektotepon ecte • en hmepa kpeiceωc hn ymei tolerabilivs erit • in die ivdicii qvam vobis,

where $\hat{\eta}$ has been changed to $\hat{\eta}\nu$ in the Greek.

The same form occurs again in v. 24.

. 20. Confusion between qui and quia.

The scribe is constantly in peril of a confusion between these forms, especially when the word that follows begins with an a.

Acts ii. 6,

QVIAVDIEBANT VNVSQVISQVE.

Here it should be *quia*: but the Latin was misunderstood, and then the Greek, instead of

OTI HKOYCEN EIC EKACTOC,

becomes

KAI HKOYON EIC EKACTOC.

Notice at the same time the harmonization of the Greek and Latin verbs.

Acts vii. 39,

oti oyk h θ exhcan y π hkooi genec θ e cvi nolvervnt oboedientes esse,

where cui has been read as quia, and the correct reading ϕ turned to $\delta\tau\iota$.

Sometimes the scribe himself is aware of the danger his text is in, and he places a distinguishing point in the text: e.g.

Acts xiv. 27,

KAI OTI HNYŽE ET QVIA • APERVIT.

The object of this point is, not to divide the sentence but to secure the reader or transcriber from reading it as *qui aperuit*. If the point had not been placed there we should probably have had a Greek variant

KAI OC HNYZE.

21. Cases where a false translation has been carried back from the Latin into the Greek.

Matt. xv. 11,

akoyetai kai cynïete \bullet oy han to eicepxomenō eic to ctoma \bullet koinwni ton anθρωπον

is the equivalent of

AVDITE ET INTELLIGITE • NON OMNE QVOD INTRAT IN OS COMMVNICAT HOMINEM.

Here two Greek words have evidently been confused, namely, $\kappaoiv\acute{o}\omega$ and $\kappaoiv\omega v\acute{e}\omega$; no doubt the true text is $\kappaoivo\^{i}$, but whether because coinquinat (= coincuinat) has been read as communicat, or because communicat actually had acquired the supplementary meaning of pollution, the Greek text has been reformed so as to give the normal equivalent of communicat.

The same mistake will be found in v. 20.

In a similar manner when we find in Acts xxi. 28

και εκοινωνησεν τον αγιον τοπον τογτον

and

ET COMMVNICAVIT SANCTVM LOCVM HVNC,

we must substitute $\kappa \epsilon \kappa o i \nu \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$, or at all events the aorist $\epsilon \kappa o i \nu \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$, for the text as given in the Beza Codex. The instance which we have been discussing was pointed out by Mill.

22. Cases where the corrector has substituted in the Greek a more exact equivalent of the Latin, although the Latin translator had really done his best to render the word.

Acts xix. 8,

εισελθων Δε ο παγλος εις την συναγωγην εν Δυναμεί μεγαλή επαρρησιαζέτο. Here the Latin text is conflate;

CVM INTROISSET AVTEM PAVLVS IN SYNAGOGA CVM FIDVCIA MAGNA PALAM LOQVEBATVR.

A reference to Mark viii. 32 will shew that palam loqui is an attempt to render $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma \iota \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$: but cum fiducia magna loqui is another attempt at the same thing, and apparently the first translation: it has given rise to $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ in the Greek.

Another case where the conflation of two possible Latin renderings has produced a corresponding conflation in the Greek is Acts xx. 18.

It should run

ως δε παρεγενοντό προς αγτον ειπέν προς αγτογς,

the first line of which was rendered in two ways:

AD VBI VENERVNT AD EVM

and

SIMVLQVE CVM ESSET (=ESSENT),

and the Greek accordingly adds at the beginning of the second line

OMWC CONTWN AYTWN.

In Acts xxii. 23 the translator has had before him

και κονιόρτον Βαλλοντών εις τον αερά.

he rendered the last word in caelum as it was perfectly right to do, caelum being the regular equivalent; and the corrector carried back the word into the Greek in a more exact form, and substituted oὐρανόν. True, the Latin text is lost here, but the Greek tells its own tale.

The converse correction will be found in Matt. xvi. 3,

πγρραζει γαρ CTYΓNAZWN O AHP.

In Matt. xvii. 15, the words

KAI KAKWC EXEL

would seem to be rightly translated by

ET MALE PATITUR.

Must it not then be by reflex action that we find in Cod. D

KAI KAKWC TTACKEI?

In Luke ii. 6 the text may be taken

επληςθηςαν αι ημέραι,

which the scribe rendered

CONSVMMATI SVNT DIES;

but consummati sunt would be more nearly the equivalent of ἐτελέσθησαν, which is placed in the Bezan text. A still stronger correction is made in verse 21, where we have συνετελέσθησαν.

In Luke iv. 5 the translator rendered

THE OIKOYMENHE

by

OMNIA REGNA MVNDI,

and then because $\kappa \acute{o}\sigma \mu o s$, for sooth, is the proper word for mundus, we have the Greek

тоу космоу.

In Acts xvi. 34 the translator was obliged to use a periphrasis for $\pi avoikei$ and so he gave, properly enough,

ET EXVLTABAT CVM TOTA DOMV SVA,

and the Greek takes this up, and we have, instead of the original πανοικεί.

και ηγαλλιατό εγν τω οικώ αγτού.

In Mark iii. 5 the scribe had done his best to render πώρωσις by means of the verb emorior, which means not merely to die, but to become void of feeling (cf. Celsus v. 28. 14: clavus...saepe emoritur); but the reviser put the more exact equivalent νέκρωσις into the text: hence

 επι τη νέκρωσει της καρδίας αυτών svper emortva cordis eorum.

In the very next verse he rendered συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν by consilium faciebant, and again the Greek was corrected,

CYNBOγλΙΟΝ ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΈC ΚΑΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ CONSILIVM FACIEBANT ADVERSVS EVM.

If in Mark iv. 21 the accepted reading is

мнті єрχεται o λγχνος,

then we must say that, by some confusion between accedo and accendo, the text of Cod. D has become:

MHTI AΠΤΈΤΑΙ Ο ΆΥΧΝΟΟ NVM QVID ACCENDITVR LYCERNA,

where, however, we can hardly help feeling that the Beza text ought to be right. In any case the variants find their motive in the Latin.

In Mark viii. 2

προσμενογείν μοι

has been freely paraphrased by

EX QVO HIC SVNT;

and word for word it goes back into the Greek

απο ποτε ωδε ειςιν.

In the very next verse, the translator gave

DE LONGE VENERVNT,

as translation of

απο ΜακροθέΝ ειςιΝ,

and then εἰσίν is displaced by ἥκασιν.

In Mark viii. 13 ἐμβάς is expanded for Latin readers to

ASCENDIT IN NAVEM,

and hence

εΝΒΑς εις το πλοιοΝ.

In Mark vi. 36, we find

INA ΑΠΈλθοΝΤΕΌ ΕΙΌ ΤΟΎΟ ΕΓΓΙΟΤΆ ΑΓΡΟΎΟ VT EVNTES • IN PROXIMAS VILLAS.

The translator rendered τοὺς κύκλφ ἀγρούς by in proximas uillas: but proximas did not seem a near enough equivalent to the Greek, so the reviser has given us ἔγγιστα.

In Mark vi. 39 the idiomatic συμπόσια, συμπόσια was translated secundum contubernia; and we have in the Bezan Greek

ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ CYNTTOCIAN.

Mark vi. 47 gives us

IN MEDIO MARE

as the translation of a primitive

εν μεςω της θαλαςτης.

Harmony is restored by reading, as in Cod. Bezae,

ем месн тн валассн.

Mark vii. 4 reads

kai att afopac otan $\varepsilon \lambda \theta \omega c$ in et cvm venerint a foro.

It would seem that the Latin is the free rendering of a^{α} a^{α} a^{α} a^{α} a^{α} a^{α} , and that the two last words in Greek are an addition for the sake of equivalence. But perhaps the added words are a gloss of some later hand, and not of the translator; in the Arabic Tatian Harmony we have a different explanation, viz. quod emptum est; i.e. they wash what they buy from the market. It is clear that the abrupt a^{α} a^{α} a^{α} a^{α} puzzled the translators.

In Mark xi. 32 the scribe translated

оті онтыс профитис ин

by

QVIA VERE PROFETA ERAT,

but a more exact equivalent of *uere* was $\partial \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$, which accordingly is put in the Greek.

Acts iv. 21, the passage to be translated was

мн εγρισκοντές το πως κολασωνται αγτογς,

and the writer gave

NIHIL INVENIENTES CAVSAM QVA PVNIRENT EOS,

inserting causam just as the Coptic and Syriac versions do, in order to express the meaning more closely. Then $ai\tau iav$ creeps into the Greek after $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho i \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau \epsilon_{S}$.

23. Omission of such words as $\hat{\eta}\mu\hat{\epsilon}\rho a$ in the Greek descriptions of time.

Acts xvi. 11,

και τη επιογέη είς ΝεαπολίΝ,

the proper Latin of which is

ET SEQUENTI DIE NEAPOLIM;

and now ἡμέρᾳ must be restored to the Greek, so that we have και τη επιογεή ημέρα εις Νεαπολίν.

Acts iv. 5,

εγενετο Δε επι την αγριον ημέραν, where the word ἡμέραν has been brought in from the Latin

Another way of removing the apparent inequality is to strike out *diem* in the Latin: we find in Acts iv. 3.

KAI €θΈΝΤΟ ΕΊC THPHCIN ΕΊC THN ΕΠΑΥΡΙΟΝ
ET POSVERVNT IN ADSERTIONEM IN CRASTINV.

Matt. xxviii. 15

єшс тис симером имерас

for

IN HOERNVM DIEM,

where $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho a s$ is borrowed from the Latin.

With these cases we may notice Mark vi. 2, where

KAI FENOMENOY CABBATOY

has been rendered

ET DIE SABBATORVM.

and hence the Greek becomes

каї нмера саВВатши.

With the foregoing we may take the cases of translation of $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \rho i \tau \hat{\eta} \eta \mu \epsilon \rho q$ and similar expressions. We shall find that the Latin translator renders such a term as $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \rho i \tau \eta \eta \mu \epsilon \rho q$ by post tres dies, or post tertium diem. When, therefore, the reviser with his little Latin and less Greek goes over the text, he finds an apparent discord between the languages; although the translator meant by post tertium diem the third day after. And so he corrects the Greek.

Hence in Matt. xvi. 21 we have

KAI META TPEIC HMEPAC ANACTHNAI ET POST TRES DIES RESVRGERE.

Matt. xvii. 23,

KAI META TPEIC HMEPAC EFEPOHCETAI ET POST TRES DIES RESVRGET.

Acts x. 40.

TOYTON O ΘC ΗΓΕΙΡΈΝ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΤΡΙΤΗΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ HVNC DS SVSCITAVIT POST TERTIVM DIEVM.

In all these cases the correct reading would seem to be established as $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \rho i \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a$.

The argument is, however, complicated by the fact that in Mark viii. 31 we find

META TPEIC HMEPAC ANACTHNAI ET TERTIA DIE RESVRGERE.

Here codices a k, which may be suspected to contain our most archaic Latin text, read post tertium diem: so there has been, in all probability, a correction made on the Latin side. But the matter will require a closer enquiry, both in the Greek and Latin.

24. Further cases of elliptical expression in the Greek, where the Latin text has proved a reactionary influence.

In Acts xiii, 22 the text should run

EYPON DAYEID TON IECCAI,

which is rendered

INVENI DAVID FILIVM IESSAE,

the Latin language not favouring the omission of filius. Hence we have $\nu i \delta \nu$ carried over into the Greek

EYPON DAYEID TON YION IECCAL.

In John xxi. 2,

και οι τογ Ζεβεδαιογ

becomes

ET FILI ZEBEDAEI,

and so the Greek replaces $\tau \circ \hat{v}$ by $v \circ i \circ i$.

25. Confusion between ἀλλα and ἀλλά.

If we turn to Matt. xx. 23 we shall see that the translator or reviser does not always feel sure about his Greek, where $a\lambda\lambda a$ and $a\lambda\lambda a$ could be confounded one with the other; for he renders

ογκ εςτιν εμών τούτο δογναι αλλοίς ητοιμάςται

by

NON EST MEVM DARE ALIIS PRAEPARATYM EST,

and we may very well ask whether there is any case of reflection upon the Greek text from such misunderstandings in the Latin. Let us look at John vi. 23; probably the original was

αλλα ΗλθέΝ πλοιαρία,

but here $\dot{a}\lambda\lambda\dot{a}$ was read as $\ddot{a}\lambda\lambda a$ and rendered

ALIAE NAVICVLAE VENERVNT:

and then, to prevent any further mistake or misunderstanding in the Greek, the text is changed to

αλλων πλοιαρείων ελθοντων.

26. Translator's use of tunc for καί.

The translator has often avoided the monotony of the sentences connected by $\kappa a \lambda$, by using tunc as a substitute, with the ultimate effect either of displacing $\kappa a \lambda$ by $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon$, or, at all events, of pushing $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon$ into the Greek text:

e.g. Mark i. 36,

KAI KATEΔIωŽAN AYTON
TOTE CIMWN KAI OI MET AYTOY
ET CONSECUTI SUNT EVM
TUNC SIMON ET QVI CVM EO ERANT.

Here tunc has got into the Greek in the second line, and hence we have both readings in Greek and Latin.

Mark ix. 35,

TOTE KABICAC E ϕ WNHCEN TOYC • $\overline{\text{IB}}$ • TVNC CONSEDIT ET VOCAVIT • XII •,

where $\tau \acute{o}\tau \epsilon$ stands for a primitive $\kappa a \acute{\iota}$.

Mark xiv. 27 is a similar case,

τοτε λεγει αγτοις ο ίης,

and the same thing occurs in Mark xiv. 34.

We shall now pass on to give a series of similar Latinizations which do not so readily admit of being grouped together.

CHAPTER X.

FURTHER CASES OF LATINIZATION.

The previous chapter contains a spicilegium of the cases of Latinization which occur in the Codex Bezae. A few further instances are to be given which do not so readily admit of classification.

In Matt. v. 24 the Bezan reading is

και τοτε ελθων προςφερείς το δωρόν coy,

where $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ for $\pi\rho\delta\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon$ is due to the spelling of the Latin:

ET TVNC VENIENS OFFERES MVNVS TVVM.

This case was pointed out by Wetstein. Matt. v. 40.

και ο θέλων coi κριθηναί και τον χείτωνα coy λαβείν QVI Volverit IVDICIO CONGREDI ET TVNICAM TVAM ACCIPERE:

upon which Middleton remarks (p. 481) "This has strongly the appearance of being a rendering from qui uoluerit (i.e. $\delta \theta \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ for $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \acute{\epsilon} \lambda o \nu \tau \iota$) by some one who did not look forward to the end of the sentence."

In Matt. v. 46,

tina meic θ on e \overline{z} etai qvam mercedem habebetis.

Here *habebetis* is apparently a dittograph for *habetis*, but it has been read as a future; and the Greek altered to correspond. Of the change in the Greek there seems no doubt; there is, however,

some reason for believing that the Latin error is not palaeographical, but belongs to the dialect of the translator, who used a reduplicative form of the verb *habeo*. We shall return to this point later on.

A curious case which seems to be traceable to Latinization is Matt. ix. 20,

και ίδογ γγνη αιμορροούςα δωδέκα έτη et ecce mylier flyxym sangvinis habens XII annis,

Here fluxum sanguinis habens is the equivalent of $ai\mu\rho\rho\rho\rho\sigma\hat{v}\sigma a$. Knowing what we do of the mode of structure and reformation of the Greek text, we feel sure that habens would in time be carried over as $extit{e}\chi\rho\nu\sigma a$. But if it were, it would certainly be attached to $\delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa a$ $extit{e}\tau\eta$, and then we should not be surprised at the reading which we find in Codex L,

δώδεκα ἔτη ἔχουσα ἐν τῆ ἀσθενείą.

This reading is not in our MS, though Stephen refers it to β : he often confounds Codices D and L. But it seems to be an error of the same kind as those which we are studying.

Matt. x. 30,

ymwn de kai ai tpixec the keфadhe, sed et capilli capitis vestri,

has been corrected by carrying $i\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$ to the end of the sentence and translating sed et by $i\lambda\lambda\hat{a}$ κai .

Hence

αλλα και αι τριχές της κέφαλης γμών.

In Matt. xiii. 29 the correct text would seem to be

EKPIZWCHTE AMA AYTOIC TON CITON,

which is very well rendered

ERADICETIS SIMVL ET TRITICVM CVM EIS.

This goes back to the Greek as

EKPIZWCHTE AMA KAI TON CEITON CYN AYTOIC.

In the same chapter the translator has twice to find a proper translation for $\delta \sigma a$.

In Matt. xiii. 44 he renders ὅσα ἔχει very well by omnia quae habet; and the Greek takes up the added word and appears as

MANTA OCA EXEL

In v. 46 he rendered $\delta \sigma a \epsilon i \chi \epsilon \nu$ by

QVAE HABEBAT,

and this time the Greek is corrected to

απελθων επωλησεν α είχεν.

In Matt. xiii. 48

ΗΝ ΟΤΕ ΕΠλΗΡωθΗ • ΑΝΕΒΙΒΑCANTEC

has been rendered

CVM AVTEM INPLETA FVERIT . EDVCENT EAM,

and then the Greek changes to the Beza reading

οτε δε επληρωθη • ανεβιβασάν αγτην.

In Matt. xviii. 9 the translator, with pardonable freedom, has prefaced a new clause by the word *similiter*,

SIMILITER . ET SI OCVLVS TVVS . SCANDALIZAT TE,

and an attempt has been made to render the added word by the prefixing of $\tau \delta$ $a \dot{v} \tau \delta$ to the Greek

το αγτο ει και ο οφθαλμός τος τκανδαλίζει τε.

In Matt. xviii. 22.

ογ λεγω coi εως επτακίς αλλ εως εβλομηκοντακίς επτακίς

NON DICO TIBI SEPTIES SED SEPTVAGIES SEPTIES.

Here the African Latin usage is perfectly correct; as we may see from Capella, VII. § 737, "sexies septuagesies dipondius facit quadringentos trigies dipondius." But the Greek text had $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\tau\hat{\alpha}$ for $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\tau\hat{\alpha}\kappa\iota\varsigma$ in the second line, the Latin usage being to say "seventy times seven times," and the Greek "seventy times seven." The reviser, then, seeing that septies in one line stood for $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\tau\hat{\alpha}\kappa\iota\varsigma$ and in the next for $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\tau\hat{\alpha}$, has corrected the Greek text to the form in which we have given it above.

In Matt. xix. 28

καθισεσθε και αγτοι

has been made into

KABICECBE KAI YMEIC

because the Latin, properly enough, had given

SEDEBITIS ET VOS.

In Matt. xx. 17 I suspect the true text to be

MEλλωN ΔE ANABAINEIN O IHC.

To translate this exactly would have required a participial periphrasis; hence the Latin

ET ASCENDENS IHS HIEROSOLYMA,

from which the Greek

KAI ANABAINWN O THE

In Matt. ii. 9 it seems as if in rendering

επανω ογ ην το παιδίον

by

SVPRA PVERVM,

which it must be allowed is not a very close translation, the way had been made for the Greek corrector to write

επανώ του παιδιού

which is the Bezan reading.

A few verses on there is another instance where the scribe had to render the words $\tau \delta$ $\pi a \iota \delta \delta o \nu$ several times; he gave puer as the equivalent, but in these cases, Matt. ii. 13, 14, 20, the corrector substituted in the Greek the more exact equivalent $\tau \delta \nu \pi a \iota \delta a$.

In Matt. xv. 9,

порры апехеі ап емоү

was rendered

LONGE EST A ME,

with the result that $\epsilon \sigma \tau \ell \nu$ displaces $a \pi \epsilon \chi \epsilon \iota$ in the Greek.

In Matt. xv. 27,

και γαρ τα κγναρία εςθιογείν απο των ψείχων,

where the Latin is

ET CANIS ENIM

EDENT DE MICIS,

the plural verb in Greek has been produced by the parallel Latin verb in the corresponding line.

In Matt. x. 42 we have a case where the Latin translator

C. B.

has translated $\psi \nu \chi \rho \delta \nu$ by aqua frigida, with the effect of forcing back aqua on the Greek text¹.

ποτηρίον γλατός ψύχρος • είς ονόμα μαθητός calicem aquae frigidae in nomine discipuli.

In Luke xiii. 35 the translator seems to have used a little freedom in rendering $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$ $\epsilon \tilde{\iota}\pi\eta\tau\epsilon$, by

DONEC VENIAT VT DICATIS,

and the Greek becomes

εως μ<u>ξ</u>ει οτε ειπητε.

In Luke xii. 51 he rendered δοῦναι εἰρήνην by pacem facere: and the Bezan Greek shews

Δοκείτε οτι είρηνην παρεγενομήν ποιήςαι.

In Acts xii. 15 we have the passage

οι δε ελεγον προς αγτην ο αγγελος αγτογ εςτιν

prettily translated by

QVI AVTEM DIXERVNT AD EAM FORSITAM ANGELVS EIVS EST.

And forsitan goes back into the Greek as τυχόν.

Bearing in mind the equivalence between these two words in the translator's or reviser's mind, we can explain Luke xx. 13

түхом тоүтом емтрапнсомтан

FORSITAM HVNC

The Greek should read loo_{∞} , but the other was the reviser's word.

In Acts iii. 22,

ek των αλελφων ημών ως εμού αγτού ακούςεςθαι de fratribus vestris tamovam me ipsum avdietis.

¹ Wetstein, Proleg. p. 32.

Here the Latin is perfectly correct, if we place a point between me and ipsum: but the reviser has run the two words together, and corrected the Greek from ως ἐμέ αὐτοῦ to ως ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ; i.e. "you shall hear him as if it were myself."

It is instructive to notice that in c. vii. 37, where the same quotation occurs, the text has been fortified against misunderstanding by a point as well as by the line-division, and we have

DE FRATRIBVS VESTRIS TAMQVAM ME-IPSVM AVDIETIS,

and no error in the Greek.

In Matt. xxv. 10, where the Greek

απερχομένων δε αγτών αγοραζαι

has been translated by

CVM VADVNT EMERE,

a corrector has concluded that a more exact equivalent of the Latin would be

єше упагочен агорасаі.

In Matt. xxvii. 65 and 66,

фүлакас and мета тып фүлакын

stand for

κογετωδίαν and мετά της κογετωδίας

because the Latin is

CVSTODES and CVM CVSTODIBVS.

In Luke viii. 30 the text probably stood

πολλά γαρ εισηλθέν εις αυτον δαιμονία,

which, no doubt, was rendered

MVLTA ENIM INIERANT DAEMONIA.

But enim inierant easily became enim erant, and then the Greek was corrected to

πολλά Γαρ ΗςαΝ ΔαΙΜΟΝΙΑ.

In Luke xxiv. 44 the translator had nothing in Latin to answer to the Greek $\mathring{\omega}\nu$, and of course he paraphrased

ETI WN CYN YMIN

into

CVM ESSEM VOBISCVM.

The Bezan Greek now stands

EN ω HMHN CYN ŸMEIN.

In Matt. xxviii. 19,

MAθΗΤΕΎCΑΤΕ ΠΆΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΕθΝΗ BAΠΤΙCANTEC AΥΤΟΎC DOCETE OMNES GENTES BAPTIZANTES EOS,

we might maintain that $\beta a\pi\tau i\sigma a\nu\tau\epsilon_{S}$ was rightly translated by baptizantes: but it may be suggested on the other hand, in view of the occurrence of $\beta a\pi\tau i\zeta o\nu\tau\epsilon_{S}$ in all other copies except the Vatican Codex, that the Greek reading (for the Latin is certainly right) is due to assonance.

In Mark i. 10 the scribe had to render

ειδεν εχιζομένογε τογε ογρανογε,

for which he gave

VIDIT APERTOS CAELOS.

Hence the Greek ηνυγμένους.

In Mark i. 16,

амфіваллонтас єм тн валассн

would naturally be rendered

MITTENTES RETE IN MARE.

The elliptical Greek is brought to order by inserting $\tau \hat{\alpha} \delta \hat{\iota} k \tau \nu a$ over against the Vulgar Latin retias. (Note that the Vulgar Latin turned the neuter plurals into feminine singulars; thus in the present case the word for 'a net' is not rete but retia. A good deal of confusion arises from this peculiarity.) This is not a case of assimilation to Matthew $\beta \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \rho \nu \tau a_S \hat{a} \mu \phi i \beta \lambda \eta \sigma \tau \rho \rho \nu$, but, even if it were, the Latinization remains, for $\hat{a} \mu \phi i \beta \lambda \eta \sigma \tau \rho \rho \nu$ has been replaced by $\tau \hat{a} \delta i k \tau \nu a$, which must be under the influence of the form retia.

In Mark v. 15 the translator rendered $\tau \delta \nu \delta a \iota \mu o \nu \iota \zeta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$ by illum qui a daemonio uexabatur, and thence $a \dot{\nu} \tau \delta \nu$ has crept into the Greek:

KAI ΘΕωρογείΝ ΑΥΤΌ
ΤΟΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΖΟΜΈΝΟΝ
ΕΤ VIDENT ILLVM
QVI A DAEMONIO VEXABATVR,

The same mistake occurs in the next verse

AΥΤω Τω ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΖΟΜΈΝω EI QVI DAEMONIO VEXAVATVR.

In Mark vii. 5 ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν was rendered by interrogant eum...dicentes. It is no wonder, then, that we find λέγοντες thrust into the Greek.

In Mark vii. 25, we find

AKOYCACA ΠΕΡΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ VT AVDIIT DE EO,

and so we have ω_s prefixed to the Greek as an equivalent for ut.

In Mark viii. 36,

TI ΓΑΡ ωφελης του αυθρώπου εαν κερλης του κος ανό ολου QVID ENIM PRODERIT HOMINI SI LUCRETUR UNIVERSUM ORBEM.

Here $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ has been replaced by $\epsilon \hat{a} \nu \kappa \epsilon \rho \delta \hat{\eta} \sigma \eta$ on account of the rendering $si\ lucretur$.

Mark ix. 34,

ΔΙΕΛΕΧΘΗCAN
ΤΙΟ ΜΙΖωΝ ΓΕΝΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤωΝ
DISQVIREBANT
QVIS ESSE ILLORVM MAIOR,

where esse stands for esset. Then the words $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \tau a \iota a \dot{\iota} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ are added to the Greek text.

Mark x. 10,

οι μαθηται αυτού περι του αυτού λογού επηρώτησαν αυτον

DISCIPVLI EIVS
DE EODEM SERMONEM
INTERROGAVERVNT EVM.

Mark x. 12. The scribe paraphrased the participial construction

και εαν αγτη απολγέαςα τον ανδρά αγτης αλλον Γάμηςη · Μοιχαται and translated

ET SI MVLIER EXIET A VIRO ET ALIVM DVXERIT • MOECHATVR.

This is intelligible enough in Latin; can the same be said of the reformed Greek?

> και εαν γίνη εξελθή από του ανδρός και αλλον γάμητη ποιχαταί.

Mark x. 16,

KAI ENAFKANICAMENOC AYTA

has been misunderstood: the scribe was not quite at home with the word; in Mark ix. 36 he had given it as ἀνακλισάμενος: here he boldly assumes it to be a compound of καλέω, and renders it

ET CONVOCANS EOS:

then the Greek becomes

και προςκαλεςαμένος αγτά.

Mark xiv. 1, the scribe found

ΗΝ Δε ΤΟ ΠΑCΧΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΑΖΥΜΑ.

ηλθεν Δε η ημέρα των αzymων,

and rendered it

VENIT AVTEM DIES PASCHAE,

and the reviser went back and corrected the Greek text to

ηλθεν Δε η ημερα τογ πα<u>ςχα</u>.

In Mark, then, he had no need to translate τὰ ἄζυμα, and discarded it; and it is erased accordingly from the Greek.

Mark xiv. 36,

ογχ ο εςω θελω αλλ ο ςγ θελεις,

 $\theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ has come from the Latin

NON SICVT EGO VOLO SED SICVT TV BIS.

Mark xiv. 56,

πολλοι γαρ εψεγλομαρτγρογη ελεγοη κατ αγτογ MVLTI ENIM FALSVM TESTIMONIVM DICEBANT ADVERSVS EVM,

Here $\check{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma o\nu$ has merely come in to balance dicebant in the same line.

Traces of a similar error may be found in the following verse. In Mark xvi. 11,

και ογκ επιστέγσαν αγτω,

the Latin is missing: but it must have been

ET NON CREDIDERVNT EI,

where *ei* by the way is feminine, so that the Greek has been corrected: and there is no doubt the whole Latin sentence simply stands for the single Greek word

HITICTHCAN.

The prefixed $\kappa a i$ shews that $\dot{a} \kappa o i \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ in the previous clause was rendered by audierunt et.

In Luke v. 8,

ο δε cimωn προσεπέσεη δίτου τοις ποςin simon avtem procidit ad pedes eivs.

Here the Greek should have $\gamma \acute{o}\nu a\sigma \iota \nu$ for $\pi o\sigma \acute{\iota}\nu$, which is fairly translated by the Latin *ad pedes*. We see the Greek has been corrected.

Sometimes, as in Acts ii. 17, the reviser's correction can be seen to underlie an error of the text: we have

και οι πρεςβγτεροι ενγπνιαςθης ονται et seniores somnia somniabunt.

Here the Greek had originally $\partial v v \pi v lois \partial v v \pi v la\sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o v \tau a \iota$, which was rendered by somnia somniabunt; but the reviser corrected the dative case of the Greek into the accusative of the Latin; and the $\partial v \dot{v} \pi v \iota a$ dropped out as a dittograph of $\partial v v \pi v \iota a \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o v \tau a \iota$.

In Acts ii. 47,

και εχοντές χαριν προς όλον τον λαον,

the translator gave

ET HABENTES GRATIAM APVT TOTVM MVNDV,

much in the same way as a Frenchman would say tout le monde; and the revising hand has replaced λαόν by κόσμον.

In Acts iii. 24,

και των κατέξης ο ελαλήςεν

is due to

ET EORVM QVI ORDINE FVERVNT QVODQVOD LOCVTI SVNT,

quotquot having been misspelt as is common throughout our text (t=d), and then read as quod; accordingly $\delta\sigma ou$ disappears, giving place to δ .

Acts v. 9,

and συνεφώνησεν is substituted as a more exact equivalent of conuenit. This case was noticed by Mill.

Acts vii. 1,

ει ταγτα ογτως έχει

was rendered

SIC HAEC SIC HABENT.

ει αρά τούτο ούτως έχει.

Acts vii. 52,

KAI ΑΠΈΚΤΕΙΝΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΥC ΤΟΥC ΠΡΟΚΑΤΑΓΓΕΛΛΟΝΤΑC ET OCCIDERVNT EOS QVI PRAENVNTIAVERVNT,

where ayroyc has been put in to balance eos.

Acts viii. 13,

KAI BAΠΤΙΟΘΕΙΟ ΗΝ
KAI ΠΡΟΟΚΑΡΤΕΡώΝ
ET BAPTIZATVS EST
ET ADHEREBAT PHILIPPO,

where $\hat{\eta}\nu$ has been taken with $\beta a\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon i\varsigma$ and so κai became necessary in the second line.

Acts xiv. 4,

HN Δε ECXICMENON TO ΠλΗΘΟΟ DIVISA AVTEM ERAT MVLTITVDO

for $\epsilon \sigma \chi i \sigma \theta \eta$ for the sake of parallelism.

Note in the same verse the effect of rendering of $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$, of $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ by alii.

kai oi men hcan cyn toic ioydaioic alloi de cyn toic atioctoloic et alli qvidem erant cym ivdaeis alli vero cym apostolis.

Acts xv. 26,

BapnaBa και παγλω ανθρωποις παραδεδωκας την ψγχην αγτων BarnaBa et Pavlo Hominibys QVI tradidervnt anim svam.

The Latin shews the original to have been $\pi a \rho a \delta \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \delta \sigma \iota \nu$ which the reviser took to be the exact equivalent of tradiderunt, and made the necessary vocalic change.

Acts xvii. 23,

EN W H FEFPAMMENON

for

εν ω επεγεγραπτο,

the Latin being

IN QVA SCRIPTVM ERAT.

Acts xix. 19,

CYNENETKANTEC TAC BIBAOYC

was rightly translated so as to bring out the force of $\sigma \hat{\nu} \nu$ by

ADTVLERVNT ET LIBROS,

and kal is inserted against et in the Greek text.

Acts xix. 30,

OYK EIWN AYTON OI MABHTAI

was changed to

οι Μαθηται εκωλύον,

the Latin being, however,

DISCIPVLI NON SINEBANT.

The scribe had already translated the same verb in a different way: for in Acts xiv. 16 he had given sanauit omnes gentes as a rendering for $\epsilon i a \sigma \epsilon \nu \pi \dot{a} \nu \tau a \tau \dot{a} \epsilon \theta \nu \eta$, as if the word came from $i \dot{a} o \mu a \iota$. Now he avoids the difficulty by changing the words.

Acts xx. 12,

HEAFEN TON NEANICKON ZWNTA

for

ΗΓΑΓΕΝ ΤΟΝ ΠΑΙΔΑ Ζώντα

because the word $\pi a \hat{\imath} \delta a$ had been rendered in the Latin, properly enough, as

ADDVXERVNT IVBENEM VIVENTEM.

Acts xx. 23,

κατα πολιΝ

having been rendered by

PER SINGVLAS CIVITATES,

an additional word seemed necessary in Greek: hence we have

κατα παςαν πολιν.

A very complicated, but at the same time convincing case of reaction will be found in Acts xix. 29,

kai cynexy θ h oxh h moxic aicxynhc et repleta est tota civitas confusionem.

The Greek is impossible, and must be due to correction badly administered; and the question is, how did the impossible reading $al\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\nu\eta_{S}$ arise? Evidently it has been put in to balance confusionem. Now that the words in question do correspond, from the point of view of our translation, may be seen from Luke xvi. 4, where $al\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\nu\rho\mu al$ is rendered confundor. Further, in Matt. xx. 28, in the long interpolated section we have $\kappa al \kappa a\tau al\sigma\chi\nu\nu\theta\dot{\eta}\sigma\eta$ as the equivalent of et confondaris. Moreover, in Luke xiv. 9, we have $\mu\epsilon\tau'$ $al\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\nu\eta_{S}$ rendered by cum confusione, and in Luke ix. 26, ôs $\gamma\dot{a}\rho$ $\dot{a}\nu$ $al\pi\epsilon\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\nu\theta\eta$ (for $\dot{\epsilon}\pi al\sigma\chi\nu\nu\theta\dot{\eta}$) $\mu\epsilon = qui$ enim confusus fuerit me. There is therefore no doubt about the origin of $al\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\nu\eta_{S}$, and the Latinization of the passage is demonstrated.

The next question is whether $ai\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\nu\eta_{S}$ is a pure addition to the text, or whether it has displaced some other word? In favour of the latter hypothesis it may be urged that $ai\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\nu\eta_{S}$ is in the

genetive; this looks as if it had displaced some word in the same case. This could very well happen if the word $\sigma v \gamma \chi \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \omega_s$ had stood in the text, its genetive case being dependent on a preceding $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta$. The present Greek text may then be regarded as a mixture of two readings

και εγνεχγθη όλη η πόλις

and

και επληςθη όλη η πόλις συγχύσεως.

We should then have to decide in some way between the two readings in the matter of priority.

If, on the other hand, we hold $ai\sigma\chi\dot{\nu}\nu\eta$ s to be a mere addition from the Latin, we must say that the genetive is due to the fact that $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma\theta\eta$ was also carried back, but subsequently displaced by the original reading $\sigma\nu\nu\epsilon\chi\dot{\nu}\theta\eta$. The problem is a pretty one, especially in view of the early attestation of both the suggested primitive forms. Of one thing we may be certain, and that is that the Latin is all right as it stands, and needs no correction except the erasure of the final m. Moreover, we are certain of the Latin influence on the Greek as it now stands in the Bezan text. Concerning the other points at issue we prefer to reserve our opinion for the present.

We have now verified completely the hypothesis to which our investigations of the Beza text led us, viz. that the Greek text has been thoroughly and persistently Latinized. We do not think it will be doubted, in view of the many Latin readings which we detect in the Greek, that the case is completely proved. It will not any longer suffice, to say that we prove consent but not corruption. When the equivalents of obsolete Latin forms turn up in the Greek, there is corruption; when Latin verses appear in a Greek dress, there has been Latin interpolation: and so we have a clear and convincing demonstration of conspiracy as against the old-fashioned hypothesis of concurrence. Griesbach's hasty dismissal of the question must now be considered an unhappy blunder: and we must revise our critical methods accordingly. We have arrived at these results, without complicating the question by asking whether any important codices or any of our great editors were in the conspiracy: we need to be on our guard against the popular prejudices in favour of great names.

It is by this time clear that Dr Hort's opinion, that the Latin of Cod. Bezae has been forced into agreement with the Greek, must be rejected: the force is in the majority of cases exactly in the opposite direction. Starting from the demonstration of Latinism in the Beza Greek, we must now enquire what Mss. have absorbed similar errors, and see how far their corrupted texts can be restored. And this is no slight task, and for the criticism of the New Testament it is of infinite moment. For the present we will simply say that the new light we have obtained will often shine into very dark corners.

We shall presently return and study a little more closely the Vulgar Latin forms, from which we diverged in order to discuss the question of Latinization which those forms forced upon us.

CHAPTER XI.

GENEALOGICAL RELATIONS DEDUCIBLE FROM THE PREVIOUSLY DEMONSTRATED LATINIZING ERRORS.

WE will now take a glance over the results already arrived at, to see how far they affect other New Testament texts. We do not, of course, assume that our judgment is final in regard to the development of error in each one of the passages quoted, but we simply say that our results have been tabulated as far as possible without prejudice, and with only an occasional reference to authorities other than D, whose character might be compromised by the investigation. But, if there be any truth in our demonstration of the process of Latinization which has gone on in the Codex Bezae, we cannot stop at this point; we want to know whether any errors that we have noted affect the whole Latin tradition, and whether they have spread beyond that tradition. Now, in the nature of the case many of the errors referred to are short-lived; they only remain for a few generations, and some of them may have only the lifetime of a single copy. At the same time there are others which shew a remarkable persistence. For instance, to recur to a case previously referred to from Matthew v. 22, where we find qui pascitur for qui irascitur; we are almost sure that this error arose in a bilingual Codex, for it is the error of a bilingual scribe and is caused by the equivalence of a Latin p and a Greek ρ . Now we have pointed out that this error is in the Codex Claromontanus of Irenaeus, so that it may be said with confidence that it belongs to the translator of Irenaeus; but no translator would have invented such an extraordinary reading; it must therefore have had its equivalent in the Greek text of Irenaeus or have been current in the Latin Gospels of his translator.

It should be remembered that Codex k, which is generally taken to be an African version, shews the same reading. The bilingual error must, therefore, have been widely diffused. And do not let us assume that this error was absent from the textual ancestry of D.

Next consider the reading which we previously discussed from John xxi. 22, 23. The concurrence in error here brings together the texts D d a b c ff^2 g and the Vulgate with Ambrose and Jerome: the smaller group formed by D d ff^2 and the Vulgate being perhaps a little nearer together than the rest.

In Mark ix. 15, we have noted the concurrence of D d b c f² i k with Tatian in the misreading and corresponding mistranslation of $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\tau\rho\dot{\epsilon}\chi\sigma\nu\tau\epsilon$ by $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\chi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\nu\tau\epsilon$ s.

In Luke xxiii. 53, we find D d c theb appropriating a Latin hexameter verse.

In Mark v. 9¹, all the Latins seem to support the first $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\nu}$, the second is added by the company

D
$$d$$
 B 69, 124, 238, 346 b c f g^{1} g^{2} i l q vg .

In Mark vi. 3, εἰσίν is represented in

$$\ \, D\ d\ a\ b\ c\ f\ f\!\!\!/\, g^{_2}\ g^{_1}\ g^{_2}\ i\ l\ q\ vg.$$

In Mark viii. 2², note the substantial concurrence of D d a b c i in the expression ex quo hic sunt.

In Mark ix. 34, the Latin *esset* has been carried back into the Greek of D and 2^{pe}: and in a different form by 13, 69, 346.

In Mark x. 27, the added $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$ is found in

D al. pauc.
$$a b c f ff^2 k q vg$$
.

In Mark xiv. 36° , the addition of $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$ has Greek support in 13, 124, 346.

In Luke viii. 25, the addition of ἐστίν seems to be in all codices except B*ALX. 1, al.¹². Is it the genuine reading?

In Luke i. 78⁴, either **&**BL have fallen under the influence of a Latin *uisitabit*, or D and most of the other texts have made the converse error by retranslating *uisitauit*. The Latin forms are to be regarded as equivalent and interchangeable.

In Matt. xv. 32¹, the intrusive *hanc* is found in a number of Greek MSS.; also in the following authorities

[b]
$$c f [f^1] g^2$$
 me Hilary and Ambrose.

In John xvii. 11, the eccentric conflation has influenced the copies D d a c e.

In John viii. 262, the intrusive article is found in

$$D d a b f f f^2 l q.$$

In John xiv. 30, the article appears in

$$d\ a\ b\ c\ e\ f\ f\!\!f^2\ g\ l\ q\ vg$$
 and 1. 346. $2^{\rm pe}$ and others.

In John xvii. 14, notice the agreement between D a c f q in the insertion of the article.

In Mark viii. 2³, the addition of τούτου to the Greek finds a corresponding Latin in

$$a\ b\ cff^2\ g^1\ i\ q$$

and the Greek is followed by L. The same addition may be seen in the Memphitic and Peshito Syriac.

Matt. ix. 264, the curious error of D is followed by

71. 435.
$$g^{\text{ser}}$$
 al. and theb

while the error itself assumes an underlying Greek text, which is found in

XC 1. 33. 118. and me.

Matt. xviii. 20⁵ brings together for an astonishing reading

$$D d g^{1}$$
.

Acts v. 32, D is followed by E⁶.

John xii. 47, d and e agree in reading meorum berborum.

Acts v. 3, D has the support of the Vulgate.

Matt. x. 42⁸, the Latin tradition is all for *minimis*. But note that Cod. 157 conflates the Greek $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \iota \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ with the translation from the Latin $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \lambda a \chi i \sigma \tau \omega \nu$.

Matt. xiii. 48, the same thing seems to be true for κάλλιστα.

These two instances are of peculiar importance, in that they intimate the occurrence in the Latin either of an irregular trans-

lation of an adjective in the positive degree, or of the duplicated positive.

The reader may confirm his faith in the existence of this duplicated form by comparing Matt. v. 39 in Cod. k, non resistere adversus nequam nequam; where nequam nequam represents nequissimum; and is conclusive in favour of the masculine interpretation of malo.

In Mark i. 38¹, we have again a difficulty in the fact that $\xi\xi\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta\sigma\nu$ is only supported by \aleph BCL 33. But our method would shew it to be right: for the other reading is explained.

Mark xv. 14, ἔκραζον is supported by

ADGKMPII 1, 69, 346 and 25 others.

Assimilation to the text of Matthew may have contributed to this?

In Luke viii. 27, we are again confronted with a dilemma between \(\mathbb{R}\)BL\(\mathbb{E}\) 1. 33. 151. 157 me reading ἐνεδύσατο and the other uncials and cursives supporting D and the Latin tradition. Again D would seem to be wrong.

Matt. xvi. 262, the choice lies between

XBL 1. 13. 22. 33. 61. 157: 346. y^{scr} e f q me theb

against the general Latin tradition and all the rest of the uncials &c.

Mark x. 13. The right reading $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau i \mu \eta \sigma a \nu$ must be sought in $\aleph BCL\Delta$.

John xvii. 14, the reading of D ($\mu\iota\sigma\epsilon\hat{\imath}$) is followed by $a\ e\ q$ and a group of cursives.

Mark vi. 39, the reading ἀνακλιθῆναι is supported by **\S**BG 1. 13. 28. 69. 2^{pe}. al. 10: the rest of the company being with D.

Matt. ix. 28³, D is supported in καὶ ἔρχεται by a b c g¹ h k.

Matt. xiii. 4, Cod. B alone of the uncial texts with 13. 124 seems to have the original reading.

Matt. xvii. 7⁴, we find the uncorrupted texts to be ℵB 13. 124. 346.

Matt. xx. 30, we have again the consensus in error of D and the Latins.

¹ p. 73. ² p. 74. ³ p. 75. ⁴ p. 76.

Matt. xxi. 6, D and the Latins have some support from the Sahidic and Syriac; but was not this to be expected in such a construction as participle and verb?

Matt. xxvi. 51. Here again most of the Latins agree with D, and, as might have been expected, the Syriac versions.

John vi. 11¹, D is supported in its error by \aleph a b e q and the Syriac versions, which last ought perhaps not to be counted.

John xii. 36², D and the Latins are again together in the resolution of the participle and verb into two verbs.

Luke v. 14, shews agreement again between D a e, other old Latins and the Vulgate.

Luke xv. 23, D finds no support outside the Latin company and some versions.

Mark iv. 36, the aberrant company is

D 13. 28. 69. 346.
$$2^{pe} b c eff^2 i q$$
.

Mark vii. 25, the inserted $\kappa a \lambda$ is given by D Δ , from the Latins. Mark x. 16³, D is accompanied by $b \ c \ ff^2 k \ q$.

Mark x. 22, we have D in error with $b c f f^2 q$.

Acts xiv. 21⁴, the Latinization has affected AEHP as well as D.

Matt. xiii. 22, for σπειρόμενος D has the company of a c g¹ ff² k. Matt. xiii. 24, σπείραντι is the reading of ΝΒΜΧΔΠ 13. 33. 346 al². It is surely right; and D, with the later uncials, has Latinized.

Luke ii. 16, D is only supported, outside the Latins, by Cod. 61.

And so we might continue our examination, but the results are sufficiently patent: we may say that the hypothesis of Latinization is shewn conclusively to be the right one for the explanation of the text, since so many readings of D are unsupported in Greek, while almost all are followed by the Latin. Next we see that occasionally whole battalions of later uncials take up the Latinized reading, while a small company remains faithful, usually including B.

Amongst the codices which have occasionally Latinized will be found $\&L\Delta$, &c.; whether B has been entrapped in any cases into error is a question which must not be prejudged, and it almost requires a special and extended investigation; but it looks as if B had escaped.

The majority of the Latin texts (perhaps all of them) are derivable from a common source, their concurrence in singular errors being inexplicable on any other hypothesis, but whether this source be European or African, Gallican or Roman, remains as yet uncertain. And this being the case, and the authority of D having, for the greater part, been reduced to that of d, the practical problem is, to restore the lost Western text in its primitive Vulgar Latin form, and to reason from the single form thus reached, as being the equivalent of a very early Greek MS.¹

So extensively has the Greek text of Codex Bezae been modified by the process of Latinization that we can no longer regard D as a distinct authority apart from d. In the first instance it may have been such; or, on the other hand, it may have been the original from which the first Latin translation was made. But it is probably safest to regard D+d as representing a single bilingual tradition. The process of Latinization is not a late one consequent on the rapprochement in a bilingual codex of two texts, an old Western Greek and an old Western Latin respectively; for this bilingual tradition goes back to the earliest times. It can be traced in Irenaeus, in the ancestry of NCL, and in the parentage of the Egyptian versions. Any residual divergences between D and d are due to unequal criticism of correcting hands.

¹ In Luke xvi. 26, d reads

chaus magnum confirmatus est,

where chaus came in through the loss of the repeated syllable in chasma magnum. In this error it is supported by b c f fr l vulg. Ambrose, Hilary and Augustine. If this means anything, does it not mean a common Latin original for the Gospel of Luke in the authorities referred to?

CHAPTER XII.

SOME PHONETIC AND GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE BEZAN SCRIBE.

1. On the local pronunciation of the initial letters JU.

An examination of the Codex Bezae will shew the scribe's pronunciation of these letters. We may expect, if he is a French scribe, to find a transitional pronunciation of the same kind as that by which the French language derived such a word as *jusque* from *de usque*: i.e. we may expect that there was a predominance of the *d* sound over that of *g*.

Turn to Acts xx. 19, where

εν ταις επιβογλαίς των ιογδαίων

is rendered by

EX INSIDIIS AD IVDAEIS.

Here ad iudaeis clearly stands for, and should be printed a diudaeis.

The scribe writes diu for what we represent by ju, so that there was a consonantal sound to the initial letter, something like what we should render by dy.

Next turn to Mark x. 21,

EK NEOTHTOC MOY AD IVVENTYTE MEA.

Here again we should print

A DIVVENTVTE MEA1.

¹ Notice how the Vulgar Latin has again conserved something in its pronunciation from the primitive form, if we may assume with Curtius, Gr. Etym. 230, that the root is the Sanskrit $d\hat{e}v\hat{a}$.

A similar case occurs in the Lyons Pentateuch where the scribe had to write the word Jebusaeorum; he actually wrote Zebusaeorum, and those who have noted the interchange in the Old Latin texts of the forms zabulus and diabulus, baptizo and baptidio, exorcizo and exorcidio in Mss. will see what the archaic pronunciation of the word in question was. It could not have been = Yebusaeorum.

We see the same thing in the Lyons Pentateuch in Lev. x. 7, where $\dot{a}\pi\dot{a}$ $\tau\hat{\eta}$ \hat{s} $\theta\dot{\nu}\rho as$ $\tau\hat{\eta}s$ $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\hat{\eta}s$ is translated

ad ianua tabernaculi.

Certainly the words should be divided so as to read a dianua.

Under the same heading probably belongs the Bezan reading of zosum for deorsum (sometimes written diosum) in Acts xx. 9, and Cod. k (Matt. i. 12) dechonias for iechonias.

2. On the pronunciation of the adjacent letters SR.

We find SDR STR for SR in proper names. For this change, which is what we should expect in a Latin Ms., seeing that the Latins render Ezra by Esdras, and give Hasdrubal as the equivalent of Azrubaal (עור בעל), our text furnishes a frequent illustration in the spelling of Israel.

E.g. Matt. ix. 34, $\epsilon \nu$ $i\sigma \rho a\eta \lambda = \text{in istrahel, but in x. 6, oikov}$ $\epsilon \iota \sigma \rho a\eta \lambda = \text{domus israhel.}$ So in x. 23 (israhel).

John xii. 14, $\tau o \nu i \sigma \tau \rho a \eta \lambda = istrahel.$

In Luke xxiv. 21, we again find the spelling *israhel*, otherwise generally the spelling is *istrahel*¹, and in not a few cases the Greek imitates the Latin spelling.

The case is important (1) as indicating a real phonetic difficulty amongst certain Latin-speaking peoples; (2) because the influence of the Latin text on the Greek appears not only in the Codex Bezae, but also in the famous Codex Vaticanus, and the spelling carries with it an intimation of the probable existence of Western readings in that text.

On p. xlviii Scrivener says: "ϊστραηλ John xii. 13; Luke ii. 32, iv. 25; Mark xii. 29. ϊστραηλιται Acts xiii. 16, xxi. 28 (but in the Latin istrahel in 26 other places, istrahelitae in 3 others." Compare p. xliii: "istrahel etc. always except in Luke xxiv, 21," There is some confusion here,

It is interesting to observe that this difficulty of pronouncing sr, and the insertion of t between the discordant sounds, can often be traced in the Romance languages: e.g. the French ancêtre is from antecessor, through an[te]cessre; connaître, from cognoscere through conoistre; être from essere by estre. It does not however seem that the modern Italians feel the difficulty so keenly as the ancient Latins and the French, for they give us a few such forms as sradicare sregolamento.

3. On the so-called impure S, and the prefixed vowel that often attaches to it.

The initial s in Italian when followed by a consonant is usually called 's impure.' It is so congenial a sound to the Italian language, that it has been extended by analogy to many words where it does not etymologically belong; but on the other hand I think we ought to recognize that, the further back we go in our study of the Italian language, the more likely are we to find that the forms with s impure are genuine forms derived from the archaic speech.

For example, let us see what Scrivener says of the Codex Bezae¹:

Such forms as sconspectu Acts vii. 46, and yet more scoriscatio Matt. xxiv. 27, scoruscus Luke xvii. 24, scorusco, xvii. 24 bis, xxiv. 4² (ἀστραπή and ἀστράπτω, but fulgur Matt. xxviii. 3, Luke x. 18) savour more of the initial impure s of the Italian, which plainly sprung from the Latin ex, e.g. sbarcare, scarnare.

Now, leaving upon one side the question as to whether any cases of the Italian impure s can be conceivably traced to the Latin prefixes, let us ask whether it is not possible that after all the form scoruscus, which our Ms. so decidedly affects, may not be archaic, and as good as the more usual coruscus. According to the authorities in philology, the word comes from an ancient reduplicated Sanskrit root, skar, which means to oscillate rapidly backward and forward, and hence to gleam, to dazzle: skar-skar, the reduplicated root, being easily worn to scorsco and scorusco, the middle s being thus a testimony to the ancient initial s which it duplicated 3.

It appears then that the scribe who wrote the first copy of the Latin of Codex Bezae (for the peculiarity is evidently primitive,

¹ p. xlv. ² Query: add ix. 29.

³ Vaniçek, Etym. Wörterbuch, p. 1246 (from Brugmann).

and similar forms have probably been weeded out in many places) was brought up in the use of Latin which, whether provincial or not, was marked by archaisms of speech. It would clearly be unfair to call these forms early French or early Italian. We may perhaps class them as Vulgar Latin without depreciating their antiquity. But, having noted this peculiarity once, let us point out a similar feature in the Greek of the great Vatican Codex (Cod. B). Twice in the last chapter of Matthew we find the scribe of B writing the word κουστωδία in the form σκουστωδία. The peculiarity is not noted by Tischendorf, but this is probably due to the fact that he did not pay attention to what he took to be a mere scribe's blunder, if indeed he observed it at all. What shall we say of this word? it is clearly a Latin loan-word in the Greek text; its prefixed sibilant is certainly not a sayour of an Italian impure s: it is at least doubtful whether the form is a reminiscence of a Latin Bible with which the scribe may have been familiar, although I can very well believe such a form would be hailed as a proof of the Western origin of Codex B. Obviously the real explanation is that σκουστωδία is an archaic form. It has been the fashion to refer custos and custodia to a root $kudh = \kappa \epsilon \dot{\nu}\theta - \omega$, but it may be conjectured that the root had a prefixed spirant and is rather to be referred to sku, to cover, to hide, especially since we find the form preserved in the Latin scutum for the long shield which covers the body.

Accordingly we have noted a second instance where the vulgar speech of the New Testament writers and their translators would seem to be archaic. I propose, therefore, to regard these spellings scoruscus and scustodia as belonging to the earliest current forms of the New Testament writers'.

The other case quoted sconspectu is more difficult; we can scarcely assume that any such form as scon could have been current after Indo-germanic times: it must then be a vulgar form of speech; and not, I think, the form of the scribe of Codex Bezae, but of some earlier scribe; for we shall see presently

¹ It is important to register all such peculiarities; suppose, for example, there should be reason to suspect that a Latin document underlay the closing verses of St Matthew's Gospel, we should then read in xxvii. 65 not habetis custodiam but habete scustodiam.

that the Bezan scribe himself does not shew any fondness for the impure s.

The question of course is, as to whether the existence of such forms connotes a peculiar locality: a problem which is not by any means confined to our Manuscript, but turns up constantly in the Vulgate and Italic texts.

For example, in the very interesting discussion which occurred not long since in the pages of the Academy as to the origin of the Codex Amiatinus, it was stated by Dr Hamann that the scribe must either have been an Italian, or at any rate the text must have been taken from an Italian exemplar. For, said he, we are directed to Italy and to no other country by such forms as senes for senex, senia for xenia, optimantum, gigans, ancxius, uncxit, sussaltastis, ammirata, quemmammodum, cluserunt, hostia, tophadius, agusto, ascultabant, clodum, adtractaverit, redemet, histriatarum, expendebat, scandescet, Spaniae, totum belli impetu, in tantum arrogantiae tumore, incidemus in manu Dei et non in manus hominum etc.

Hamann's assertion was met by Professor Sanday, who in an Appendix to the second volume of the Oxford Studia Biblica² discussed the instances in detail, and pointed out how ill-supported were Hamann's rapid generalisations. Dr Sanday further appealed for some fresh light on the subject of the Codex Bezae. "The form scandescet...in Sap. v. 23 has many analogies in that remarkable MS. Cod. Bezae....It were much to be wished that we knew where Cod. Bezae itself was written. The common view, as we have seen, assigns it to the South of France."

We have done our best in the earlier part of this book to prove that the Codex Bezae belongs to some place not far from the Rhône Valley, and we hope that we have either settled the question or have made it easy for some one else to settle it. For our part, we take that for a fixed point of departure. And it is clear that with this for our starting point we have only to discriminate the forms which actually belong to the Bezan scribe from those forms which may have been imported into his text by genealogical transmission from earlier copies.

¹ I quote from Studia Biblica, n. p. 286.

² pp. 309 sqq.

Now, bearing in mind that the natural tendency of the French language is to get rid of the impure s by prefixing a vowel (e.g. Étienne, étable, espérer, école etc.), we must expect to find in our text cases of such a prefixed vowel; and we should be very much surprised if they were wholly absent from a writer who follows the pronunciation so closely in his writing.

In Luke xviii. 32, we have

iniuriabitur et espuent in eum.

In Acts xvi. 19,

quoniam ispes et reditus eorum.

It appears from these instances that the scribe was averse to the initial combination of sp. How weak it was in French may be seen from the fact that in many cases the s wore away after the vowel had been prefixed, as, for instance, in $\acute{e}p\acute{e}e$ from $spada^1$.

How then are we to explain the fact that a scribe who was averse to the combination of the letters sp was so tolerant of sc?

We have suggested that one way out of the difficulty would be to defend the genuineness of the form scoruscus which we find in our text. It is a curious thing, however, that the modern Italian, with its extravagant fondness for words beginning with sc, does not use this stem except in the form coruscazione. Yet it must have been a popular form, at least, if not a genuine one: and if so, why does it not turn up in Italian?

But even if it be a genuine form we have still to explain the other word *sconspectu*. So that if such a form be thought impossible in Southern France, we have another reason for believing that the Latin archetype of Cod. D was brought from the other side of the Alps.

Rönsch² draws attention to the fact that the Codex Vercellensis has a parallel instance in Luke xxii. 31, 'postulavit vos ut

 $^{^1}$ The prefixed i or e before s is not assumed to be confined to France. Rönsch, $Itala\ u.\ Vulgata,\ p.\ 467,\ gives$ instances of it from the Codex Fuldensis, which is supposed to be by the hand of Victor of Capua; from the Veronese Psalter, from Isidore and the Codex Toletanus etc., and one instance from Tertullian. We note also in Cod. Vercellensis, Mark ix. 20 ispumans.

² Itala u. Vulg. p. 468.

scribraret tamquam triticum.' Here D reads cerneret, and the Cod. Veronensis is illegible for the doubtful word, but it looks as if it were uentilet. Possibly scribraret is here the original translation. Is it conceivable that the impure s which we are discussing is an Africanism?

Upon the whole, we cannot say that we have as yet come to a clear understanding upon this question: but it may be more intelligible as our investigation proceeds. The fact is we want to know something more definite about the relations of Codex Bezae and the Old-Latin codices.

We may compare with what has been said above as to the obscuring of the *s impurum* in French, what Le Blant says on the subject from the stand-point of epigraphy¹.

Des vocables iscala, ispiritus, Istephanus, ispes, ischola, istetit, ismaragdus, iscripsit, istudium, nous avons fait : escalier, esprit, Étienne, espoir, école, été, émeraude, étude.

Our results confirm his as to the form *ispes*, at any rate, which cannot be regarded as a copyist's blunder. Le Blant adds in a note to the following effect:

D'après les rapprochements que l'on vient de voir, les mots étable, étang, estrade, espèce, épine, époux, escabeau, escient, espace, épi, estomac, état, étrangler etc. me semblent montrer qu'en latin le vulgaire a dû dire istabulum, istagnum, ispecies, ispina, isponsus, iscabellum, iscire, ispatium, ispica, istomachus, istatum, istrangulare.

4. On the interchange of final M and NT in the Codex Bezae.

We frequently find an equivalence between forms ending in m and those ending in nt: and though, at first sight, it seems as if we had to do with a merely palaeographic error (which certainly is likely enough in MSS. like Codex Bezae and the Lyons Pentateuch, which write final nt in a single letter, by crossing the last stroke of the n), yet a closer examination convinces us that the error is phonetic, and that the final nasal sounds are subject to confusion.

First let us look at some of the cases: then at the causes.

We have Acts xi. 22, Barnabant for Barnabam. Acts xii. 16, eunt for eum.

¹ Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule, p. exviii.

Perhaps a similar case occurs in Acts xiii. 47,

ut sint in salutem usquae ad ultimum terrae,

where we propose to correct sint into sim.

Now turn to John xvii. 14, where we have

et mundus odit eos quoniam non sum,

where it is clear from the Greek that sum stands for sunt. We have already pointed out how this error has given rise to a remarkable conflation in John xvii. 11, where the Bezan text is supported wholly or in part by Codd. a c e.

Now this singular Latin error is explained at once by the dialectical forms of the Vulgar Latin, from which sprang the Italian sono, which is both first person singular and third person plural. Let us interrogate the Latin inscriptions and see where this tendency to equivalence shews itself. According to Sittl¹,

Auslautendes NT wird nur in Italien durch nasales M ersetzt: fecerum I. N. 2037 (Nola), 2775, 2824, 7197. Gruter, 686, 3 (Rom) Perret catac. de R. 5, 29, 68, Orelli-H. 7360 (Rom): convenerum Marini Atti t. 40, a 21 (J. 218); comparaverum Fabretti 5, 11; emerum Bold. 53 b 6; posuerum ib. 381, 1; dedicarum Orelli 3740 (bei Lanuvium); comparabirum und commendaberum Lupi p. 24 (Tibur J. 613).

From these instances collected by Sittl we see the direction in which to look for the origin of the peculiarities which we noted in our text. They are certainly more Italian than French; and if this be so, then we again suspect that the text of Codex Bezae came to Lyons from the other side of the Alps².

I have not found any instance of this error in the Lyons Pentateuch.

5. On the inflexional forms in the Codex Bezae.

Let us now see how it stands with the noun-inflexions in our Codex: how do they answer to the Vulgar Latin?

We know that in the Vulgar Latin the neuters disappear,

¹ Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten, p. 70.

² There are two cases of the kind in Cod. k, viz.

Matt. xiii. 54 stuperem for stuperent. xiv. 5 habebam for habebant.

It is conceivable, in view of the many transcriptural blunders in k, that these are scribe's errors; but on the other hand, they may merely be intimations that we are dealing with a real dialect, which was not French.

taking on masculine or feminine forms as the case may be: the neuter plurals in particular appearing as feminines of the first declension 1. We are not then surprised to find that our text writes regularly the form retia: e.g. John xxi. 6, retiam: v. 8, retiam piscium: v. 11, non est scissa retia, and so in many other places. After a while this singular form will develop its own plural as a feminine noun; though not necessarily the classical plural; for the study of the Romance languages shews us that the formation of a plural by the addition of s becomes soon a rule, as it must have been in the earliest times of Latin speech; what constitutes the motive for this apparent reversion to type is more difficult to see; it may be the influence of the oblique case; it is however certain that in the Provencal the plural of such a word as corona is coronas, while the Old French gives corone corones: thus we find an s established at a very early period indeed in French 2.

We shall expect then to find traces of neuter plurals which give rise to feminine plurals, and of feminine plurals which are made by the addition of s.

For instance, in John iii. 20, we have

ut non arguantur operas eius de luce.

Here we have *opera* turned to a feminine, and the new plural formed in Vulgar Latin fashion.

Again, in Acts ii. 17, we have

et prophetabunt fili eorum et filias eorum.

This s does not appear in modern Italian, but it is in the Spanish and the French. Probably we may say in our case that the form is South-Gallic. But it might just as well be Spanish; and indeed we need to know a great deal more about the variations of the Vulgar Latin before we speak with decision on such a point.

¹ Thus in the Lyons Pent. we have castrae (dat.) and castra (abl.); and for crus we find crura.

² Schwan, *Altfranzösische Gramm.* p. 90, refers this final s to the influence of analogy, "nach Analogie der Feminine der lat. iii. Decl. haben auch die Fem. der lat. i. Decl. in Nom. Plur. ein s erhalten."

Having shewn, then, that our Ms. sometimes gives us the Vulgar Latin form of the feminine plural of nouns ending in a; let us ask whether there is any similar phenomenon with regard to masc. nouns with o stems. Here the early Latin form seems to have been for the plural to end in oe and e, which was probably a survival from oes and es: but all the words which occur in literature make the plural in i. Nor does it seem that in the Old French a plural form in s is developed; thus livre and not livres is the Old French for the Latin libri.

There is one case in our MS, which seems to involve such an s plural. In Acts xi. 21,

πολγς τε αριθμός πιστέγεας επέστρεψεν επί τον κν myltisque nymeris cum credidissent reversi sunt ad dnm.

Here the verbs shew that the singular number of the Greek has been replaced by a plural: we must then either say that multis numeris is a nominative plural, or that it is an unfortunate attempt to render the construction known as the ablative absolute, which was never completed on account of the difficulty with the verb; the latter would seem to be the correct explanation.

Now let us turn to the oblique cases; we find in the Vulgar Latin that the *accusative* and *ablative* very early exchange forms and functions; because, for example, as soon as the final m of an accusative singular ceases to be sounded, the forms of the two cases are usually phonetically equivalent.

Hence, for example, the form dono dedit is really only the phonetic weakening of donum dedit. May we say then that in our MS. in Acts xiii. 22 the rendering

ω και είπεν μαρτήρησας CVI ETIAM DIXIT TESTIMONIO,

conveys an accusative form under an ablative dress? If any one doubts the phonetic equivalence in our scribe's dialect of two such cases as testimonium and testimonio, let him look at Luke x. 4 where he will actually find sacellum written sacellu; Matt. xxvii. 51 a susu usque deorsum; and at Luke xvii. 24 where we have sub caelu for sub caelum; and let him notice the innumerable cases

where the accusative and ablative are interchanged, such as Acts xvi. 25,

circa mediam uero nocte,

Acts v. 15,

ab omnem ualetudinem,

Acts v. 26,

cum uim,

etc. etc.1

The Lyons Pentateuch shews the same weakness in the final letter: we have dece dextru eu lignu noue qua regnu sempiternu signu suu.

One consequence of this practical equivalence of the cases would seem to have been the free use of an accusative absolute, which some people consider to be an Africanism. The combination of the two cases makes the oblique case of the Old French, the genetive and dative being replaced gradually by the use of prepositions.

Before leaving the consideration of the accusative case, it may be proper to point out that the Ms. occasionally shews traces of an accusative plural formed simply by the addition of an s to the singular, just as it must have been in the earliest period of the Latin language, when, for instance, the plural of navem was navem + s = naves.

I have noticed in Codex k in Matt. xii. 4 the curious case panems propositionis: and there are one or two things in the Codex Bezae that point to a similar recurrence of the ancient usage. For instance, in Acts xiv. 17,

benefaciens de caelo uobis imbrens dans et tempora fructifera implens ciuo et iucunditate.

Here *imbrens* stands for an accusative plural. It may, however, be said that this is only a palaeographic assimilation to neighbouring words in the adjacent lines.

¹ The weakness of the final m may be seen by studying such a form as decem which shews no final consonant in Greek, nor in Vulgar Latin: e.g. John vi. 70 nonne ego uos duodeci elegi; Matt. xviii. 21 dece milium denariorum; Luke xiv. 31 in dece milibus; Luke xix. 16 dece mnas. In these last instances, however, the final letter was represented in the beginning of the next word. In Matt. xvi. 10 we have septe panes where m is lost in the closely related letter which follows.

But this explanation will not do for the following cases in the Bezan text.

John vii. 45,

nemo misit in illum manums.

Mark iii. 15,

et dedit illis potestatem curandi ualetudinems.

Leaving then the oblique case, let us come to the genetive case which is replaced in Vulgar Latin by the preposition de. We find a number of instances of this usage, and of the similar usage of ex, in our Ms. of which the following are perhaps the most remarkable.

In Luke xi. 1,

EIΠEN TIC TWN ΜΑΘΗΤWN ΑΥΤΟΥ DIXIT QVIDAM DE DISCIPVLIS EIVS.

Luke xiii. 10,

EN MIA TWN CYNAFWFWN IN VNA DE SYNAGOGIS.

Acts x. 25,

εις των δογλων vnvs ex servis.

Acts xxi. 39,

EN TAPC ω $\Delta\varepsilon$ THC KINIKIAC TARSESIS EX CILICIAE,

and perhaps Acts ii. 30,

εκ καρπογ της καρδίας αγτογ
DE FRYCTYM DE PRAECORDIA EIVS.

It is important that all these forms should be registered and classified, as they furnish new and valuable material for Romance philology, and add to the knowledge which has been derived from the study of inscriptions. I do not see anything in our results, however, that is in conflict with epigraphic conclusions. A reference to Le Blant, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule* (p. cxvi) will shew the following summary:

Dès le vi^e siècle, le français peut se pressentir. Le trouble qu'apporte la confusion du cas fait apparaître, à cette époque, la préposition, l'article de notre langue sans flexions. Au lieu de minister templi on dit déjà minester de tempulo; pour membra duorum fratrum un marbre porte membra ad duos

fratres, forme qui subsiste dans notre parler vulgaire, pour indiquer le rapport de possession. Notre pronom qui, invariable aux deux genres, se montre, dès 431, sur l'épitaphe d'une religieuse.... D'ispiritus, que l'on entend encore aux offices de villages, viendra esprit. Aiutare offre la suppression qui nous donnera le verbe aider. Dès le ve siècle santa prépare le mot sainte. Le g de triginta s'oblitère et nos pères disaient trienta comme, plus tard, nous écrirons trente. Déjà, pour eux tanto, comme pour nous le mot tant, indiqua un nombre indéterminé¹.

Just as the cases in Vulgar Latin disappear, or almost disappear, so we find the declensions of the nouns to simplify: the earliest step towards this is the resolution of the so-called fourth and fifth declensions into forms that can be classified with the others, from which indeed they must have been primitively evolved. Thus we may expect to find *dies* turn into *dieus*, as in Acts x, 40,

hunc ds suscitauit post tertium dieum.

And in the case of nouns from the so-called fourth declension, the transference to the second frequently causes a change of gender; e.g.

Luke ix. 4,

in quemcumque domum.

Luke xxii. 21,

ecce manus qui tradet,

unless qui tradet should be the simple translation of $\pi a \rho a$ - $\delta \iota \delta \delta \nu \tau o s$, or qui has ceased to be inflected.

Acts iii. 11,

in porticum qui uocatur Solomonis.

6. Pronominal and adverbial enclisis in the Vulgar Latin.

An examination of the Romance languages will shew many cases of the enclitic use of pronouns and adverbs; and it becomes a matter of interest to examine whether any of these occur in our text. Let us take for instance the adverb *ibi*: this becomes in French *if* and finally *y*: but in Italian it is used enclitically in the form *vi*. Suppose then we find in John xii. 2

et fecerunt ei cenam bi,

may we not regard the word as used enclitically, and far gone in the process of decline?

Our Ms. shews tempula (Acts xix. 24), santi (Acts iv. 30), etc.

And is not the same thing discernible in the following cases of suffixed pronouns?

Matt. ix. 19. sequebatur um.

Matt. xix. 21. et ueni sequerem.

Mark vi. 26. noluit am contristare.

Luke xi. 9. dabite for dabit ei.

Luke xiii. 7. praecideam.

Luke xiv. 12. et illi reinuitente.

Luke xxiii. 39. unus autem de malignis blasphemabat um.

3 John 15. salutante amici.

7. Phonetic Variations in the Verb-Forms.

We must now say a few words about the confusion in the verb-forms: we have already pointed out that in the archetype of our copy there was a confusion between *sum* and *sunt* just as in modern Italian. It is probable then that we shall find some other cases of confusion between the nasal terminations.

One common case is the writing of the singular for the plural: e.g.

Acts vii. 57. exclamasset for exclamassent.

Acts xiii. 27. habitabat for habitabant.

Acts xx. 18. esset for essent.

Acts xxi. 21. circumcidat for circumcidant.

Perhaps we may add Acts xvi. 27,

nomizwn ekte ϕ eyfenai toyc Δ ecmioyc existimans effvgisset cvstodias,

in which case *custodias* would be the nominative plural; but may it not rather be that *effugisset* is meant for the infinitive?

Remark also

Matt. xvii. 14. uenisset for uenissent,

where the variation has affected the Greek.

John xx. 25. dicebat ergo illi alii discipuli, where n has been superscribed.

Mark vi. 1. et sequebatur illum discipuli eius, where n has been superscribed.

There are a number of instances of this confusion in the text of the Lyons Pentateuch.

Another important change of which our MS. shews frequent traces is the substitution of the e vowel for i, especially in the

third person singular; and since we sometimes find the opposite error, we must assume the sounds to have been nearly equivalent. The Ms. is full of such exchanges (e.g. Matt. iii. 9, putetes = putetis; iv. 5, suscepit = suscipit; v. 28, omnes = omnis; v. 34, sedis = sedes; xi. 13, omnes = omnis; xii. 24, potestes = potestis etc. etc.). In this respect it is very like the Lyons Pentateuch, which has scores of such confusions.

The result of these errors is apparent in the language and in the particular texts where they occur; in the language because there is produced an approximation between a number of present tenses to the future tenses, which assimilation ultimately makes way for the introduction of a new future, made with the auxiliary habeo; and in the particular texts, because there is a bilingual reaction from the modified Latin to the Greek.

For instance, in Luke xxii. 21,

TOΥ ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΤΟΣ ΜΕ QVI TRADET ME,

where tradet is not meant for a future, but for a present; cf. Mark xiv. 20, 21 where παραδίδοται is twice rendered tradetur. Again, in John xii. 25,

qui amat animam suam perdet eam,

where either the future *perdet* has been taken as a present, or conversely; for the Greek Mss. fluctuate suspiciously between $\partial \pi o \lambda \delta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ (D etc.) and $\partial \pi o \lambda \lambda \delta \epsilon \iota$ (NBL).

M. Robert points out that this approximation between the present and future tenses holds also for those future forms which are more divergent from the present tense-forms: thus he cites as future tenses abominamini inquinamini sanctificamini. We have the same thing in Cod. Bezae: Luke vi. 21, saturamini: Acts i. 5, baptizamini, are certainly future tenses.

The participial formations shew great variation, the following being the most common changes.

NS to S.

Luke iv. 40. impones for imponens. Luke xii. 16. dices for dicens.

¹ See Robert, pp. lxx, lxxi.

NS to N.

Acts xix, 16. insilien for insiliens.

NS to NT.

Luke v. 16. orant for orans. Acts x. 20. dubitant for dubitans.

Cf. Luke xv. 1. erat autem adpropriant,

where adpropiant would seem to be an adjective.

These confusions may be illustrated from others which occur in the verb-forms: e.g.

Acts xxi. 21. docens for doces2.

Matt. xvii. 27. inveniens for invenies.

Luke xiii. 25. incipientis for incipietis.

Matt. v. 11. dixerin for dixerint.

Luke xviii. 9. confidens for confident.

Perhaps Mark iii. 11. cum uideret illum (if the Greek is ἐθεώρουν).

Such forms are difficult of classification: in the Romance languages the participle present appears in French as *chantant*, in Provençal as *chantans*, and in Italian as *cantante*. The general fluctuation which we find in our text will hardly fall exclusively under any of these heads.

8. On the use of the Vulgar Latin future in the Codex Bezae.
On p. xliv of his introduction to the Codex Bezae, Scrivener notes the peculiar employment of habeo as an auxiliary verb:

We find (he says) in the style of d distinct traces of the employment of habeo as an auxiliary verb, which is well known to be a notable characteristic of the modern languages of Western Europe (of the French as much as any) as distinguished from the Latin whence most of them sprung. In Mark xiv. $27~\sigma\kappa a\nu\delta a\lambda (\sigma a\sigma\theta au~(-\theta\epsilon)^3$ is rendered scandalizari habetis by d, but scandalum patiemini by ac, scandalizabimini by f and the Vulgate. Habeo is used three times to render $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$, Luke x. 1: xix. 4: Acts i. 5, although the Greek word is translated by incipio 25 times (sometimes very awkwardly), 15 times by the future participle, three times in other ways.

Now there is something which all these examples have in common: they are all expressions or modifications of the future

¹ The scribe of the Lyons Pent. (p. 50, c. 17) wrote the word aperiens as aperient, but corrected his own mistake.

² The Lyons Pent. (p. 55, a. 21) writes offerens for offeres.

³ For σκανδαλισήσεσθε?

tense. A similar case will be found in the Athanasian Creed, as given, for example, in the Utrecht Psalter, in the sentence

ad cuius aduentum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis,

where the Greek version would shew either a future tense, or $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ with an infinitive. Scrivener's statement is therefore not quite complete as to the use of the auxiliary in French. It should be shewn that the French future can be analysed so as to shew the form in Codex Bezae. That is, the parallel does not lie between the future with habeo, and the preterite with avoir, but between the future with habeo, and the French and Provençal future in ai, as donnerai, for example, separated into the elements donner + ai.

When these forms are placed side by side, we see in what sense the future of the Vulgar Latin is related to the future of the French and other Romance languages¹. And it can be shewn, I think, that in some Romance dialects the attached auxiliary verb of the French remained capable of separation from the infinitive to which it belonged.

We cannot be wrong in referring a peculiarity which we find in all the Romance languages right back into the Vulgar speech of the Empire².

1 "Von den altlateinischen Temporibus sind in den romanischen Sprachen nur erhalten: das Präsens, das Imperfekt, das Perfekt und das Plusquamperfekt. Die beiden Futura werden durch Umschreibung mit habere und dem Infinitive des Präsens gebildet, z. B. cantare abjo cantare abea." Schwan, Altfr. Gram. p. 12.

² It is curious that the later Greek language shews also a future formed with $\xi_{X\omega}$ and the infinitive; but there is no linguistic connexion between the Greek and Latin forms. The earliest trace that I know of this Greek future is its intrusion into Greek Mss. from the fourteenth century onward: e.g. Cod. 418, S. Sabae of the Jerusalem Collection, a Ms. of the Invention of the Cross, has

λιμοκτον $\hat{\eta}$ σιν σε έχω έὰν μὴ ὁμολογήσης,

where a comparison with other texts shews

λιμοκτονήσω σε κτέ:

this MS. is probably of the fourteenth cent., and another curious tract of nearly the same age in the same library, Cod. 66 S. Sep., containing an $A\nu\tau\iota\lambda o\gamma\iota\alpha$ between Christ and the Devil, has

οὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοί μου φοβεροί εἰσιν· καὶ ἐάν σε ὑποδείξω αὐτοῖς πατάξειν σε ἔχουν.

Now let us turn to Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 447, where we shall find a large collection of cases where *habeo* occurs with an infinitive, under the heading *Gräcismen des Infinitivs*.

At the end of the catalogue of cases (p. 449) Rönsch adds a note saving that there are three different uses of habeo in his list; (i) können, vermögen, im Stande sein; (ii) Nothwendigkeit; (iii) das Futurum: and under this last head he refers to the Romance Futures and their origin in the Vulgar Latin. ("Bemerkenswerth ist, dass dieser Gebrauch von habere durchgehends der romanischen Futuralbildung zu Grunde liegt.") It would have been convenient if the three classes had been separated, for we clearly cannot assume that every writer who employs habeo in one of the three senses will necessarily employ it in the other two senses. Moreover it is important for us to know how far this Vulgar Latin future prevailed, which we find at the back of all the Romance languages. Does it occur, for example, in Africa? Or may we regard its occurrence as a proof that the copies in which it can be traced are European copies? Let us see what other cases there are of the translation of a future tense by the present tense habeo.

In John viii. 22 the Codex Vercellensis renders $\partial \pi o \kappa \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{\iota}$ $a \dot{\nu} \tau \dot{o} \nu$ by occidere se habet, where we see that the future really carries the force of $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \iota \nu \epsilon \nu$. We cannot then be quite sure whether the translator was working literally. Indeed the same objection may be urged with regard to the passage quoted from Cod. Bezae: Mark xiv. 27 $\sigma \kappa a \nu \delta a \lambda \iota \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ looks very much as if $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ had stood at one time in the text and been removed.

The same thing is true of Tertullian, Marc. iv. 39: "quod et ipsae uires caelorum concuti habeant" is not an immediate quotation from the Gospel (Luke xxi. 26 $\sigma a \lambda \epsilon \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \nu \tau a \iota$): Tertullian is quoting much in the same way as we should if we said "But that the powers of the heavens have to be shaken." And indeed almost all of the fifty or more cases of the use of habeo by Tertullian belong to the same category. They are not pure futures; their Greek equivalent involves $\delta \epsilon \hat{\iota}$ or $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota$ or $\dot{\delta} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\iota} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ in almost all the cases quoted. On the other hand, the frequent occurrence of these futures of necessity in Tertullian may indicate the very ground out of which the later Vulgar Latin future tense was evolved.

In the Palatine version of the Shepherd of Hermas, we find a striking case of a genuine future:

Vis. iii. 9. 5,

θελήσετε ἀγαθοποιείν καὶ οὐχ εξετε τόπον velle habetis benefacere et non habebitis locum.

Now Haussleiter¹ has brought forward very decided reasons for believing the Palatine version of Hermas to be an African translation. If this be so, then we can draw no conclusion as to locality from the occurrence of a Vulgar Latin future with habeo².

It may be of interest in connexion with the further investigation of the place and time of the Bezan translation to see how far this peculiarity of which we have been treating prevailed in the Latin of Irenaeus. We premise, then, for comparison, that the following are the Bezan instances of the future with habeo.

PATAT

VIII.G

			PALAT.	VULG.
Vis.	i. 1. 6.	μέλλω λέγειν	incipio dicere	dictura sum
	i. 1. 8.	τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν μελλόντων	gloriam venturam	futura bona
	ii. 2. 3.	τη μελλούση	quae incipit esse	quae futura est
	ii. 2. 8.	τοὺς νῦν μέλλοντας ἀρνεῖσθαι	qui nunc incipiunt	denegaturi sunt
	iii. 5. 5.	οί οὖν μέλλοντες μετανοεῖν	si ergo coeperint	acturi sunt
	iii. 8. 11.	ἄ σοι μέλλω λέγειν	incipio dicere	incipio dicere
Mand	l. iv. 3. 3.	τοῖς μέλλουσι πιστεύειν	qui credituri sunt	qui credituri sunt
	iv. 4. 4.	μέλλω λαλεΐν	dicturus sum	
	xi. 7.	μέλλω λέγειν		dicturus sum
	xi. 18.	μέλλω λέγειν	dicturus sum	
Sim.	i. 1.	μέλλετε κατοικεῖν	habitaturi estis	habitaturi estis
	i. 4.	τί μέλλεις ποιεΐν	quid facturus es	quid facies
	iv. 1.	οἱ μέλλοντες κατοικεῖν	qui habitaturi sunt	qui habitaturi sunt
	v. 3. 3.	ἔμελλες εἶναι	eras futurus	eras futurus
	v. 3. 7.	<i>ἔμε</i> λλες ποιεῖν	erogaturus eras	facturus eras
	v. 5. 4.	δ μέλλω σε ἐπερωτᾶν	quod quaero	quod quaero
	viii. 6. 2.	μέλλουσαν καθαρὰν γενέσθαι	puras mentes fu- turas	puras mentes fu- turas

It will be seen that in the Vulgate version $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ is only once rendered by *incipio*: in the Palatine version, however, it is translated in the Visions five times out of six by *incipio* and *coepi*. I have found no case, in either version, of what is so common in the Bezan text, the rendering of $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ by habeo with the future.

¹ De versionibus Pastoris Hermae Latinis, Erlangen, 1884.

 $^{^2}$ It may be interesting to note how the two versions of Hermas, the Palatine and the Vulgate respectively, render $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$. Here are some cases which we have noted:

Mark xiv. 27,

ΟΤΙ ΠΆΝΤΕς ΥΜΕΙΟ CKANΔΑλΙCACΘΑΙ QVI OMNES VOS SCANDALIZARI HABETIS.

Luke x. 1,

ΟΥ ΕΜΕλλέΝ ΕΡΧΕΟΘΑΙ VBI HABEBAT VENIRE.

Luke xix. 4,

ΗΜΕλλέΝ ΔΙΕΡΧΕΌΘΑΙ ΗΑΒΕΒΑΤ TRANSIRE.

Acts i. 5,

KAI O ΜΕλλΕΤΑΙ λΑΜΒΑΝΕΙΝ ET EVM ACCIPERE HABETIS,

(where, as we shall shew by and by, the Latin is the original, and is probably due to an African hand).

In twenty-five other cases $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega = incipio$, in fifteen cases we have a future participle and three other modes of translation; e.g. Mark xiii. 4, $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \sigma \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota = consummabuntur$, a passage which cod. k renders by incipiunt perfici.

Notice also the curious textual changes in John xiv. 30, where, the expression $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\rho\dot{\iota}$ $o\ddot{\iota}\kappa$ $\ddot{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ not being understood, a Latin interpreter assumed that habet was a sign of the future tense, and that a verb had dropped. Hence in ad we have invenire added: this goes back into D as $\epsilon\dot{\nu}\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$, and in some late Greek texts and versions (K Π , etc.) as $\epsilon\dot{\nu}\rho\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$.

And now turn to Irenaeus and examine some of the similar phenomena which appear in the Latin text.

In ii. 296 = Mass. 285,

θεὸς γὰρ ὁ μέλλων ὁρᾶσθαι

is rendered

deus enim est qui habet videri.

Here we have the same Vulgar Latin usage: but more commonly $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ is rendered by *incipio* as in i. 118 = Mass. 62,

διαθερμανθείσα την ψυχην ύπο της προσδοκίας τοῦ μέλλειν αὐτην προφητεύειν

is rendered

concalefaciens animam a suspicione quod incipiet prophetare,

the translation being almost as close and servile as in Codex Bezae.

In i. 151 = Mass. 78,

τοῦ μέλλοντος εἰς αὐτὸν κατέρχεσθαι ἀΑνθρώπου

is rendered

eius qui incipit in eum descendere Hominis.

In ii. 48 = Mass. 191,

μόσχος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνευρέσεως τοῦ νεωτέρου παιδὸς μέλλων θύεσθαι vitulus qui pro inventione minoris filii inciperet mactari,

and so in a number of other cases.

9. Decline of the prepositions.

The codex shews great decay in the forms of the prepositions; some of which are far gone on their way to French and Italian; while others are only slightly changed.

The weakness of the final t in post is seen when it comes before a word beginning with either t or d, as

Acts xx. 29,

pos diescessum meum.

Matt. xxiv. 29,

pos tribulationem.

Such assimilations between neighbouring words are however not uncommon in our text.

We notice one case of pos for post in the Lyons Pentateuch (pos hoc).

Sursum is a word which is more changed; and becomes almost French in its form.

In John iii. 31, desusum, and so in Luke i. 3; in Acts ii. 19 it is susum¹.

That the final letter was not sounded appears from *susu* in Matt. xxvii. 51. The Lyons Pentateuch shews two cases of *susum* and one of *desusum*.

Trans appears as tras in John vi. 15: cf. trasire in Luke xviii. 25. In Mark v. 21 we find transfretasset, so that it has the same weaknesses as a participial formation.

¹ This is the form which appears in the Peregrinatio Sylviae (IVth cent.), p. 46; "ecce et commonetur episcopus et descendit et sedet susum."

Deorsum = diosum in Luke iv. 10; and this appears as zosum in Acts xx. 9. We note deosum in the Lyons Pentateuch once.

Per appears once as sper: Mark v. 13, sper praeceps. The scribe has separated sper from the previous word grex by a point: otherwise we should read grexs per. Note that the form has been traced provisionally to ex per; Diez notes that in Wallachian per becomes pre and then is strengthened to spre.

There is nothing in all this which is discordant with our previous location of the MS.: and we will now leave the study of the Latin forms in the MS.², and see whether we can get any further light from the Greek side. And first, a few preliminary remarks on the Graecisms in the Latin.

¹ Diez, Gramm. p. 756.

² Many of the forms discussed in this chapter may be paralleled from a remarkable seventh-century Vulgar Latin MS. of the Acts of Peter, preserved at Vercelli, and recently transcribed by Gundemann for Lipsius' Acta Apocrypha. For instance, scoruscare will be found on p. 68, turbas for turbae (p. 73), componeretum for componeret eum (p. 51); while the future with habeo appears in such expressions as certare habent duo Iudaei (p. 70), quaecunque consumere habui (p. 77).

CHAPTER XIII.

Some Phonetic Peculiarities of the Beza Greek.

1. On the Graecisms of the Latin text of Codex Bezae.

Whether the Codex Bezae is ultimately derived from an African, a Roman or an Old French rendering, we must not forget that the Roman Church was a Greek Church in many respects, and the Old Gallican Church was Greek in almost every respect, while even the African Church had a Greek element: so that we need not wonder if we find some Graecisms on the Latin side. For an illustration of the diffusion of Greek forms, it may be noted that the Peregrinatio Sylviae, of the end of the IVth century, which has been referred to Southern Gaul, contains traces of the influence of the Greek colonists' speech upon the Vulgar Latin.

Thus Sylvia says of the services in Jerusalem,

"et cata singulos ymnos fit oratio"

"qui cata singulos ymnos vel antiphonas orationes dicunt¹."

Moreover the Vulgar Latin knew such forms as *cata unum*, however harsh they may seem to us, and out of this form was developed the Old French *chadun* = *chëun*.

Our Ms. shews one curious use of $\partial \nu \partial$ on the Latin side: it is in Luke ix, 3,

nequae ana duas tunicas habere.

This is the more curious, inasmuch as $\partial u \partial u$ is omitted in the Greek of $BCFL\Xi$, and so we must either say that it belongs purely to the Latin translator, or that it had been dropped from

¹ Gamurrini, Peregrinatio Sylviae, p. 45.

the Greek text in early times; in which latter case might it not be a Greek correction carried into the wrong column?

2. Dialectical changes in the Greek of Cod. Bezae.

Now let us examine the peculiar forms of the Greek text of our Ms. just as we did in the case of the Latin.

One of the first things that we shall notice is the irregularity of the aspiration. Scrivener gives a list of specimens of this peculiarity and makes no attempt to analyse them, thus leaving the impression that the greatest confusion prevailed in the mind of the primitive scribe to whom we owe our Western Greek.

An analysis of the instances given will shew the following results.

Four times we have an unusual smooth breathing before $\epsilon \hat{\nu} \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega$ (Matt. [2] + Luke + Acts); three times a similar feature with $\epsilon \xi \hat{\eta}_S$ ($\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \xi \hat{\eta}_S$), all in Acts; once with $\epsilon \hat{\nu} \tau \sigma_S$ (Mark) and once with $\epsilon \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ (Mark).

For the irregular rough breathing we have $\dot{\eta}\delta\dot{\nu}\nu a\tau o$ once (Mark); three times the rough breathing is found with the stem $\epsilon i\delta o\nu$ (Luke + Acts [2]): three times with $i\delta \iota os$ (Matt. [2] + Mark); once with $\delta\lambda i\gamma os$ (Acts); once we have $\epsilon \dot{\phi} i\sigma \tau a\sigma \theta \epsilon$ (Acts) and once $\epsilon \dot{\phi} a\gamma \dot{\alpha}\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ (Acts): twice we have such cases as $\epsilon \mu o\hat{\nu}$, $\epsilon \mu \dot{\epsilon}$ (Mark + Acts); observe also the forms $\epsilon \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$ and $\epsilon \lambda \pi i s$ (Luke + Acts).

Now, if this be madness, there is a method in it: for the same words shew a tendency to the same aspiration. The rough breathing with $\epsilon l \delta o \nu$ is, of course, the lost digamma; the same is true of $l \delta \iota o \varsigma$ whether its earlier form be $\sigma F \epsilon \delta \iota o \varsigma$ or $F \epsilon \delta \iota o \varsigma^2$.

We cannot be quite sure that the sixth-century scribe is responsible for the spelling of this latter word, because it occurs often in the Vatican Ms. and once at least in the Sinaitic; but we may regard it as a genuine dialectical form and not as an error. The same thing is true of $\epsilon \lambda \pi i s$ which had a digamma, and consequently appears in the Latin inscriptions as a proper name Helpis, and occasionally with a strong breathing in Mss.³ of the

¹ p. xlvii.

² Vaniçek, Etym. 1035. Note that the form καθ' iδίαν is discussed in Keil, Inscrip. Thessal. tres, p. 10.

³ See Hort, Introd, 145,

New Testament. With $\Hat{a}\gamma\omega$ the case is more difficult: according to Curtius, *Griech. Etym.* p. 676, "there can be no doubt in other cases that the spiritus asper has crept in irregularly, in $\Hat{a}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ &c...The case is the same with $\Hat{a}\gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta a\iota$ which no one thinks of separating from $\Hat{a}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$: by the side of which we get the very rare $\Hat{a}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ —especially as the derived verb now and then itself shows the lenis." It is sufficient then to remark that this case also is a recognized variation and not a scribe's blunder.

 $\epsilon \phi i \sigma \tau a \mu a \iota$ is again quite a possible form: the formation of the word $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau a \mu a \iota$ is uncertain, and we cannot say positively that the word is a derivative from $i \sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$. If, however, its origin should be sought elsewhere, the analogy of the forms would be sure to invite the aspirate and some dialects would shew it.

The case of $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\epsilon}$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\sigma\hat{v}$ is more difficult: it is complicated with the problem of the origin of the aspirated $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\hat{i}\varsigma$ (which some hold to be merely an imitation of $\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\hat{i}\varsigma$, while others will have it to be due to a misplaced spirant from the middle of the word, cf. Sanskrit asmat). There are traces of aspiration in the inflexion of the first personal pronoun which have hardly been adequately explained. Thus we have the Boeotian $\dot{i}\dot{\omega}\nu$ and the Sanskrit aham to equate with the normal Greek form $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}\nu$. Then there is the Latin dative mihi against the Greek $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\sigma\dot{i}$. It is possible then that the primitive root had an aspirated letter, which shews itself in the dialectical forms of our transcriber. Or it may be a mere vulgarism of the province where he was brought up.

 $\delta\lambda i\gamma \rho s$ and $\eta\delta i\nu a\tau o$ are more obscure. The former is usually derived from a primitive root lik, and Curtius draws an analogy between the case of $\mu i\sigma \gamma \omega$ from the root mik, and asks whether it is possible that a spirant has been lost from the middle of the word and compensated for by a rough breathing. In the Æolic dialect the word was accentuated on the first syllable, which would account for the regression of the spirant. Nor is it without importance that in this dialect and its neighbour the Thessalian, the form $\delta\lambda\iota\zeta os$ was current, which is the more curious in that the Æolic dialects usually replaced the ζ by $\sigma\delta$. We suspect then that the form of our Ms. is an Asian dialect form, not without connection with the form $\delta\lambda\iota\zeta os$ (cf. Ahrens, De Gr. Ling. Dial. i.

219). But we must be careful again in identifying this form with the dialect of our scribe; it recurs in other early MSS., e.g. in Acts xix. 23 in \aleph B, and it may be the primitive form for the Acts. For the other word $\mathring{\eta}\delta\mathring{v}\nu a\tau o$ I can give no reason.

So much for the eccentrically aspirated forms. As to the unaspirated cases, they can probably be put in a satisfactory light. The most curious is the very decided case $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \xi \hat{\eta}_s$. Curtius (p. 192) equates this with $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \iota \hat{\eta}_s$ and takes it to the same root as $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega$. We may regard it as certain that in the district represented by our writer the word was pronounced without a breathing, which almost implies that $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega$ itself had the lenis ($\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \omega$). In any case the scribe is quite decided as to the form, as he is also with regard to $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega$.

We may say then that the group of words shewing eccentric aspiration in Codex Bezae constitutes a series of dialectical peculiarities which ought to enable us to identify the nationality of the writer. Let us examine into some more of his peculiarities. A very interesting case is his spelling of the word χιτών.

Matt. x. 10,

мнтє Δγο χειθωνας мнтє γποδηмата.

Luke iii. 11,

λεγει αγτοις ο εχων δγο χιτώνας.

Everywhere else we have the usual form. Now, from the second of these instances we can see that the scribe of D has corrected his copy: he not merely has τ for θ , but he emphasises it by putting in a smooth breathing over the vowel. We may be sure then that he read $\chi\iota\theta\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma$ and, taking this with the first case, we have clearly the form $\chi\iota\theta\omega\nu$ for the original translator. This might be due to the influence of the original Semitic form, but when we find that the Ionic form is $\kappa\iota\theta\omega\nu$, we shall probably be able to divine what was meant by the scribe of the Codex Bezae. He has given us an Asian dialectical form. Indeed the difference between the Bezan uncorrected form $\chi\iota\theta\omega\nu$, and the Ionic $\kappa\iota\theta\omega\nu$ is not so great as might be supposed; for the Ionic

¹ The study of these mutations of the breathings is not without effect on the text of the N. T.: for instance, it is quite within the bounds of possibility that $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \omega \nu$ has been written $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \omega \nu$ in Matt. xi. 19, and hence corrected to $\epsilon \rho \gamma \omega \nu$.

and some other Asiatic dialects retained an explosive element in the pronunciation of the aspirates; and we see this constantly in the transliterations made by our scribe: e.g. in Betsaida for $B\eta\theta\sigma\alpha i\delta\alpha$; and the apparent metathesis of the breathing from $\chi\iota\tau\dot{\omega}\nu$ to $\kappa\iota\theta\dot{\omega}\nu$ occurs often in our text, as in Acts xvi. 16, where we have $\pi\dot{\nu}\theta\omega\nu$ represented by phytonem; and Acts xvi. 11, samotrachiam for $\sigma a\mu o\theta \rho \dot{\alpha}\kappa\eta\nu$; cf. also Mark vii. 9, $\dot{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\theta\epsilon\hat{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ for $\dot{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}\tau\epsilon$.

Let us examine more closely this question of the explosive element in the pronunciation of the aspirates. It has been pointed out by Mullach¹ that this substitution of κ for χ exists even in modern times, especially in the dialect of Rhodes; where we find έκω, στοκάζομαι, τεκνίτης; τέλω is found for θέλω amongst certain Asiatic Greeks², and very commonly the vulgar speech puts $\sigma\tau$ in the place of $\sigma\theta$; as $\epsilon\gamma\nu\omega\rho'\sigma\tau\eta\nu$, $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi'\rho\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon$. This last error is very common in Cod. Bezae, since we find in Mark iv. 1, $\kappa a \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau a \iota$ for $\kappa a \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$, where the word cannot be an indicative since it answers to the Latin sedere. In Acts xix, 25 we find $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma \tau a \iota$ for $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Now, it is concerning such forms as these that Curtius wrote (Gr. Etym. p. 418) as follows: "as early as in my review of Mullach (Zeitschr. VI. 236) I argued that this circumstance was only to be explained from a pronunciation of θ in which a hard explosive element was heard." And this explanation is probably correct; Arendt's objection that, upon this hypothesis, the forms $\chi\theta$, $\phi\theta$ would be unpronounceable falls to the ground when it is shewn from our MS. that such sounds were not pronounced. Thus we find, Mark ii. 2, συνήκθησαν: Mark vii. 34, διανύκθητι: and the form ἐκθρός occurs in Matt. x. 36; xiii. 35; xxii. 44; Luke i. 74; Acts ii. 35; xiii. 10: so that this must have been the regular form of our primitive scribe, and it is owing to correction of his spelling that we get such forms as Mark xii. 36, ἐκχθους (for ἐκθρους)3.

¹ Grammatik der griechischen Vulgarsprachen, Berlin, 1856.

² Will this help us to explain how our scribe in Matt. xi. 19 came to write θ ελόντων for τ ελων $\hat{\omega}$ ν?

³ Cf. Karsten, *De Titulorum Ionicorum Dialecto Commentatio*, p. 13, "antiquissimis temporibus iis locis, quibus litera aspirata non genuina erat, sed ex literis t et b, p et h, k et h oritur, i.e. in elisione eam ob causam omissam esse, quod assimilatio literarum tenuium ad sequentem spiritum asperum nondum facta erat, sed uterque

The same phonetic explanation furnishes us with the reason for the transcription of certain proper names; thus we find $\mu a\theta\theta a \iota o s$ constantly as against the Latin matthae u s, shewing that the first θ was sounded nearly as τ . Cf. $\sigma a \phi \phi v \rho a = sapphira$ in Acts v. 1.

We may say then that the Greek dialect of the original scribe of the bilingual tradition (and perhaps this means to a certain extent his successors the later copyists) was marked by an early pronunciation of the aspirated sounds such as probably prevailed amongst the Asiatic Greeks and in some of the islands near the coast of Asia Minor. It is necessary to bear this peculiarity carefully in mind, or we may be in danger, as we have shewn in similar cases, of referring important and characteristic forms to mere scribal errors instead of to nationality.

Further, when we find, for instance, in Mark vi. 21, the form γενεχλίοις we are not to dismiss it as the absurd mistake of a halfeducated person. There are similar changes in early and modern Greek dialects. And we must ask ourselves the question as to what Greek dialects, early or late, exhibit the change of θ into γ . Curtius draws attention to the occurrence of the Doric forms opvi-y by the side of the ordinary Greek δρνι-θ, and the shorter form δρνι-, as seen in the accusative form opviv. The suggestion is the more appropriate to our case inasmuch as our Ms. actually gives the very form öpvi in Luke xiii. 341. Moreover this form, occurring as it does in the spontaneous variations of the scribe, is not likely to be other than a genuine dialectical form. I mean that Buttmann's objection to it as being a mere grammatical refinement is probably wrongly taken. His criticism was based upon the fact that the literary Doric of Pindar and Alkman shews oppuxos, ὄρνιγα, etc., but ὄρνις and ὄρνιν². But the evidence of Photius (Δωριείς ὄρνιξ, παρ' 'Αλκμᾶνι δὲ ἄπαξ ὄρνις) would seem to shew that the form is genuine.

Now this form is set down as a Dorism³: and if the grammasonus disiunctim pronuntiabatur. Hanc autem legem non solum apud Ionas et Aeolas a quibus haec sonorum disiunctio diutissime servata videtur esse, sed etiam apud reliquos Graecos antiquiorum temporum quondam valuisse."

¹ It appears also probably as a Western reading in the Sinaitic Codex.

² Ahrens, 11. 243.

³ Ahrens quotes a similar change of $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \chi \omega$ for $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ from Cramer, Anecd. Oxon.

rians and philologians are right in recognizing it as such, it is probable that our form yevexliois belongs to the same school, which gives us two possible cases of Dorism in Codex Bezae. The Dorian Dialect held its own against the common speech in many of the Greek islands and in outlying parts of the Roman empire. For example, Suetonius observes that they spoke Doric in the island of Rhodes down to the time of Tiberius. And even where the set speech disappeared, the traces of it were never wholly lost.

But as to the explanation of the form in question we are left in obscurity. Curtius thinks that the χ of $o\rho\nu\iota\chi$ - is the mark of a diminutive suffix, and compares the " χ with the often recurring diminutive κ , and the θ with the t that serves the same purpose in the related languages." This diminutive idea is not altogether foreign to such forms as $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \theta \lambda \rho \nu$ from $\gamma \epsilon \nu \rho \rho s$.

A further peculiarity of our writer's dialect is a weakness and shifting of the liquids. In this respect his speech was marked by a feature something like that of the Romance languages where, in final syllables, $r \ln n$ are extremely mutable: e.g. the Spanish hombre = hominem: the French timbre = tympanum and perhaps trésor for tensaurus¹. The Codex Bezae shews one curious substitution of ἔρχορται for ἔρχονται, Mark xvi. 2. More common still is its change of λ and ν . Thus we have, Luke xii. 35, οἱ λύχλοι; John v. 35, ὁ λύχλον ex errore for ὁ $\lambda \dot{\nu}_{\chi} \lambda_{0S}$; Luke xii. 55, $\pi \nu \dot{\epsilon} o \nu \tau a$ is changed to $\pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} o \nu \tau a$. These are not mere barbarisms: the occurrence of the phenomenon twice shews that λύχλος is the scribe's dialectical form: the other case we should dismiss if it were not for the precisely similar case of the Greek πλεύμων as a variation of πνεύμων, along with the Latin pulmo (for pulmon). The two words evidently belong to the same classification. Pauli's explanation that πνεύμων is the later form, arrived at by an attempt to bring the word into harmony with πνέω, breaks down in view of the fact that the Ms. shews $\pi\nu\epsilon\omega$ changed to $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omega$. Yet the antiquity of the form πλεύμων would seem to be shewn by the Latin. We shall at all

^{1. 149. 6,} as an Æolism, observing however that the regular form $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta o i \sigma a$ is found

¹ See Curtius, Griech, Etym. p. 444.

events say that $\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ is an early collateral form of $\pi\nu\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, preserved for us through the Latin *pulmon* and through the vocabulary of the Greek who wrote the Beza Ms.¹ The genuineness of the form $\lambda\dot{\nu}\chi\lambda_0$ s is, I think, also capable of demonstration, however eccentric it may seem at first sight. A similar change of sounds may be noted in Luke i. 15 ($\mu\epsilon\gamma a\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\nu\omega\pi\iota o\nu\ \tau o\nu\ \kappa\bar{\nu}$), with which note that Curtius, Gr. Etym. 329, says that $\mu\epsilon\gamma al\rho\omega$ is "from a stem with ρ instead of the λ appearing in $\mu\epsilon\gamma a\lambda o^2$."

No doubt many other forms in our Greek text are capable of a similar dialectical elucidation. For instance, the form $\pi a \nu \delta o \kappa \epsilon \iota$ in Luke x. 35 is in harmony with the Ionic spelling of the verb $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa o \mu a \iota$ (as for instance in Herodotus), and with the proper name of a Trojan $\Pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta o \kappa o \varsigma$ mentioned in *Iliad* XI. 490³. The same spelling turns up in Æolic Greek, as in Sappho I. 22, where Ahrens observes that it is not a peculiarity confined to that dialect. Moreover it occurs commonly in Doric, as upon the Heraclean Tables I. 57, and in Pindar⁴. We need not then be surprised at its occurrence in our MS.

¹ Cf. the Latin *flare* and the English *blow*. We shall shew later on that the same form underlies the corrupt Western text of Acts xxvii. 15.

² From p. 547 it appears that he is quoting Buttmann, Lexilogus, r. 259.

³ Vaniçek, p. 334.

⁴ Lindemann, De Dialecto Ionica recentiore, p. 73, shews the persistence of these forms in the Asiatic Greek. "Iones in nonnullis vocabulis tenues servarunt, velut in δέκομαι σὖτις. In libellis Luciani mira Codicum constantia non leguntur formae nisi Ionicae δέκομαι et αὖτις, uno excepto loco libri de astrologia." He gives a number of similar cases from the later literature (Arrian &c.).

suggest themselves in this connexion: $\delta\delta a\gamma \circ s$ and $\delta\delta a\gamma \in \omega$ occur in Matt. xv. 14 and Luke vi. 39¹.

In Luke x. 31 we have $\kappa a \tau a \tau v \chi a$ (for $\tau v \chi a v$) where we should expect $\tau v \chi \eta v$. This is a characteristic of the Æolic and Doric dialects.

In Acts viii. 21 we have $\partial \nu \epsilon \theta \rho a \psi a \tau o$ implying the form $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega$, which, like $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \omega$, $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \omega$, characterizes the Doric and Ionic dialects; as a matter of fact it may be the primitive form².

In Luke xx. 42 we have

έν τη βυβλω των ψαλμων,

and Matt. xii. 26,

εν τη βυβλω μωυσεως.

We may infer that the scribe preferred the spelling $\beta \nu \beta \lambda \sigma_s$ if not $\beta \nu \beta \lambda \iota \sigma \nu$. It is a question whether he is Ionizing or not. According to Smyth³

"Herodotus has $\beta \dot{\nu} \beta \lambda \sigma$, $\beta \dot{\nu} \beta \lambda \iota \nu \sigma$, $\beta \nu \beta \lambda \iota \sigma \nu$. A complete mustering of these words in Stein's edition shews that the chief support of the forms with ι is derived from MSS. P, R, while in one-seventh of all passages there is no variant...The variants in favour of i are due to the scribes rather than to the influence of such actual forms in i as we find as early as 400 B.C. in Attic. The forms in i continue in Attic inscription until the second century B.C., after which $\beta \nu \beta \lambda i \sigma \nu$ is the normal form."

The evidence, then, is hardly sufficient to demonstrate, while it may suggest, Ionism; it is worthy of note that our scribe's dialect shews the form $\beta \dot{\nu}\beta\lambda os$ only and not $\beta \nu\beta\lambda io\nu$, the reason being that in the latter case the change in the accent gives the advantage to the i vowel and accelerates the change of the ν by assimilating it to the accented syllable. This makes us believe the scribe's forms to be dialectical rather than literary⁴.

¹ There is a trace of this form also in the Vatican Ms.

² A pretty case of dialectical variation, which I am unable to localize further than to say that it has an Asiatic look, is $\nu\eta\sigma\sigma\sigma$ s of Acts xiii. 6. Taken along with the Ionic $\nu\eta\sigma\sigma\alpha$ (duck), we ought to be able to decide that the idea in both words is that of swimming.

³ Vowel System of the Ionic Dialect, p. 35 in Trans. Am. Phil. Ass. 1889.

⁴ Cf. Birt, Das antike Buchwesen, p. 13 note.

A curious feature of the Ionic dialect is its exchange of ϵ for a in certain verb-forms, such as $\acute{o}\rho\acute{e}\omega$, $\tau o\lambda\mu\acute{e}\omega$, $o\emph{i}\delta\acute{e}\omega$ etc. 1

And the same feature is to be found in the Codex Bezae, where we have ἐρωτέω (Matt. xv. 23 ἢρώτουν); ἐμβριμέω (John xi. 33 ἐμβριμούμενος); καταγελέω (Luke viii. 53 κατεγέλουν); κοιμέω (Acts xii. 6 κοιμούμενος); τελευτέω (Mark vii. 10 τελευτείτω). These forms can hardly be regarded as accidental, and if not accidental, then they are dialectically significant.

For $\theta\nu\rho\sigma\nu\rho\sigma$ and one or two similar forms I am unable to give an explanation.

Reviewing the cases which we have brought forward, we find many traces of Ionism, and a few Dorisms: if we could neglect the Dorisms we should probably say that the conditions were satisfied by an Asiatic dialect somewhere north of Smyrna; and if the Ionisms could be neglected we should probably refer to that last stronghold of Dorism, the island of Rhodes.

Now, when we take the two together may we not say that, since the name of the Rhône and of certain cities in the Rhône Valley indicate an original Rhodian migration², and since the history of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne shews that there was also a later Ionic migration, all the conditions for the production of such a dialect as we find in Codex Bezae are met by the hypothesis of a Greek scribe writing in some one of the churches or monasteries in that part of France: always bearing in mind that there will be residual peculiarities which are to be traced to the primitive hands that laboured on the autographs of the New Testament books³?

We see nothing, then, in the Greek text that militates against the theory that we have so strongly supported from the Latin; viz. that Codex Bezae is a Gallican bilingual of the sixth century.

¹ See Smyth, p. 21.

² Cf. Jerome, in Galat. lib. ii. "Massiliam Phocaei condiderunt, quos ait Varro trilingues esse, quod et Graece loquuntur et Latine et Gallice. Oppidum Rhoda coloni Rhodiorum locaverunt, unde amnis Rhodanus nomen accepit."

³ We ought not to omit a reference to one other Ionism of our text; the pluperfect formations without the augment are very common. Scrivener points out seven such cases: and these are quite sufficient to indicate a characteristic of the transcriber's dialect, especially when we bear in mind that they occur all through the Ms. from Matthew to Acts, and not in any special section of it.

3. Decay of the Greek prepositions.

There are a few residual forms in the Greek which need a word or two of explanation. We must expect an occasional streak of Latin influence; indeed this has already been alluded to. Such cases are $\lambda \epsilon \pi \rho \omega \sigma \sigma s$, $\phi \lambda a \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \sigma a s$ etc. Probably to the same influence is due the exchange of the x sound for s in $\sigma \kappa \omega \lambda \eta s$, which we find in Mark ix. 48. The typical change of this kind is senes for senex; which is one of Dr Hamann's test cases for Italian forms. It is doubtful whether the geographical limits can be so sharply drawn.

Besides these occasional forms we have to notice that the Greek prepositions are already in a state of decay: we find $\mu\epsilon$ for $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{a}$, κa for $\kappa a\tau\dot{a}$, and \dot{a} for $\dot{a}\nu\dot{a}$. The following are some of the instances:

Luke xv. 30. καφαγοντι for καταφαγοντι.

Mark v. 27. πε του ιηυ for περι του ίησου.

Mark x. 1. και έκειθεν άστας for και έκειθεν άναστας.

Luke iv. 17. ἀπτυξας for ἀναπτυξας.

Acts v. 39. οὐ δυνησεσθαι καλυσαι αὐτους for καταλυσαι αὐτους.

Perhaps

Luke xxiii. 43. τω επλησοντι for επιπλησσοντι

should be referred to a similar decline of the language.

It will be said that these are accidents; I think not; we find similar traces of linguistic change elsewhere; for instance, the text of Hermas in the Codex Sinaiticus is not free from them.

4. Supposed Alexandrian forms.

Concerning the supposed Alexandrianism of such forms as ἐξήλθοσαν (Mark viii. 11), εἴδοσαν (Mark ix. 9), ἤλθοσαν (Mark ix. 33) I have no information to add to the well-known fact that similar forms occur in the Septuagint.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE CODEX BEZAE A MONTANIST MANUSCRIPT.

WE shall now endeavour to shew that the ancestry of the Codex Bezae has passed in its earliest stages through Montanist hands.

The first point to which we desire to draw attention relates to the line-division of the Codex: it is recognized that the Codex Bezae has been copied from a Ms. similarly divided to itself with respect to the lines; which is much the same thing as saying that the line-division is ancient. Indeed it was natural that such a system of division should spring up in connexion with bilingual codices.

Now turn to Luke xiii. 29, 30,

KAI Η ΞΟΥCIN ΑΠΟ ΑΝΑΤΟΛωΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΥCΜωΝ ΚΑΙ ΒΟΡΡΑ ΚΑΙ ΝΟΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΚΛΕΙΘΗ CONTAI EN TH BACIΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΔΟΥ ΕΙCIN Ε Ε ΚΑΤΟΙ ΟΙ Ε CONTAI ΠΡωΤΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΙCIN ΠΡωΤΟΙ ΟΙ Ε CONTAI Ε Ε CXATOΙ ΕΤ VENIENT AB ORIENTE ET OCCIDENTEM ET AB AQVILONE ET AVSTRO ET RECVMBENT IN REGNO DEI ET ECCE SVNT NOVISSIMI QVI ERVNT PRIMI ET SVNT PRIMI QVI ERVNT NOVISSIMI

The point to be noticed is the way in which the words $\kappa \alpha i i \delta o v$ $\epsilon i \sigma i \nu = \text{ET ECCE SVNT}$ have attached themselves to the third line. We shall now shew reason to believe that they have this position by a long inheritance.

Let us turn to the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas (c. xi.), where, in the vision of Saturus we find a description of the rapture of the Martyrs under the care of four angels to the gates

of Paradise, where they were received and welcomed by four other angels. Now, the angels who bear them on their way are, I think, derived from the Gospel, "He shall send forth his angels...and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds"; hence these angels are four in number: they are the angels of the four winds.

But according to the passage quoted from Luke, the elect do indeed come from the four winds, but the description is worded so as to end a clause with the words $\kappa a i \ i \delta o i \ e i \sigma i v$. Accordingly we find in the Acta Perpetuae the following sentence, "et dixerunt (sc. alii quatuor angeli) ceteris angelis: Ecce sunt, ecce sunt: cum admiratione." This passage has, hitherto, been unexplained: but in the light of the text as arranged in Codex Bezae, we begin to see what it means: it is an early commentary upon a badly divided text.

Here then we have our first suggestion that the Codex Bezae has as regards its ancestry passed through Montanist hands; we find a similarly divided text in the hands of the martyrs of Carthage. Let us follow the matter a little further and see whether there is anything in the actual text to confirm this opinion. We naturally look for such points as (i) the manipulation of favourite passages: (ii) the insertion of glosses which carry some special mode of interpretation; and, in particular, we should look for light on the work of the Spirit, and on the communication and interpretation of visions.

Under the heading of favourite texts, we draw attention to the singular coincidence between the reading of our Ms. in Acts ii. 17,

KAI ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥCΟΥCIN ΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΑΥΤώΝ KAI ΘΥΓΑΤΈΡΕς ΑΥΤώΝ ET PROPHETABUNT FILI EORUM ET FILIAS EORUM,

and the Latin of the Acta Perpetuae (c. i.)

et prophetabunt filii filiaeque eorum.

(The Greek text of the Acta has corrected the textual aberration.) The same reading that we have observed in Codex Bezae is found in Tertullian (adv. Marc. v. 8) and elsewhere.

¹ Matt. xxiv. 31.

Is it unreasonable to suggest that the change to *fili eorum* has been made by some one who was interested to prove what we know Justin to have affirmed, that the gift of prophecy had passed over from the Jewish Church to the Christian? May not such a change be Montanistic? In any case, note the striking coincidence between the text of D and the Carthaginian text of the second century.

Again; we know that the Acts of the Apostles is everywhere decorated with glosses, so that we might almost call it a text and a commentary, and some of the glosses are very suggestive and valuable. Are any of them Montanist? That is the question. Are there any glosses that refer to the work of the Paraclete, and to His indwelling?

In Acts vi. 10, we find

Oitinec oyk icxyon anticthnai th coфia th oych en ayt ω kai t ω $\overline{\pi}$ ni t ω agi ω ω exaxei qvi non poterant resistere sapientiae qvae erat in eo et \overline{spo} sancto in qvo loqvebatyr.

Here the added words are $\tau \hat{\eta}$ ov $\sigma \eta$ ev $\alpha v \tau \hat{\varphi}$, and $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\hat{\alpha} \gamma l \varphi$: the wisdom of Stephen was an indwelling Wisdom; the spirit which he spake by was the Holy Spirit. "Wisdom in all ages enters into holy souls and makes them friends of God and prophets."

In Acts xv. 32 the statement that Judas and Silas were prophets is enlarged on, by the addition that this was because they were filled with the Holy Spirit:

ΙΟΥΔΑC ΔΕ ΚΑΙ CΕΙΛΑC ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΙ

ONTEC ΠΛΗΡΕΙΟ ΠΝΟ ΑΓΙΟΥ

IVDAS QVOQVE ET SILAS ETIAM IPSI PROPHETAE

CVM ESSENT PLENI SPO SANCTO.

In Acts xv. 29 the Apostolic injunction to Gentile converts is embellished with the addition

EY ΠΡΑΣΑΤΕ ΦΕΡΟΜΕΝΟΙ EN Τω ΑΓΙω ΠΝΙ BENE AGITIS FERENTES IN SANTO SPO. In Acts xix. 2, as might almost have been expected, special attention has been paid to the statement about the Ephesians who did not know whether there was a Holy Ghost; and they are made to say that they do not know whether any people do receive Him.

of $\Delta\varepsilon$ thoc auton all oyle tha arion lambanoycin tinec hkoycamen,

where oudé stands for oudé ei.

Moreover the attention of the reader is drawn by the glossator, in not a few cases, to the fact that the holy men were moved of the Holy Ghost: thus, instead of saying in Acts xx. 3 that Paul was minded to return through Macedonia, the writer of the Western text tells us

ειπεν δε το πνα αγτω γποστρεφειν δια της Μακεδονίας.

In Acts xix. 1 a whole sentence is prefixed to shew that Paul came to Ephesus under the special direction of the Holy Spirit: he had been intending to go to Jerusalem, but, as in so many other cases, the Spirit suffered him not:

θελοντος Δε τος παγλος κατα την ιδιαν Βογλην πορεγεσθαι εις ιεροςολγμα είπεν αγτω το πνα γποστρεφείν είς την αςιαν.

Probably it is to the same hand that we owe the addition διὰ πνεύματος άγίου in Acts iv. 25.

Just as the commentator has shewn that the true prophet is possessed by the indwelling good Spirit, so he enlarges on the opposite kind of possession. The girl with a spirit of Python practises divination through this spirit;

Δια τούτου ΜαντεύομενΗ,

where the words $\delta\iota\dot{a}$ $\tau o\dot{\nu}\tau o\nu$ are an addition.

Now let us come to the question of visions.

In Acts xvi. 10, where Paul sees the man of Macedonia, the translator adds the explanation

ΔΙΕΓΕΡΘΕΙΌ ΟΥΝ ΔΙΗΓΗСΑΤΌ ΤΟ ΟΡΑΜΑ ΗΜΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΝΟΗCAMEN

EXVRGENS ERGO ENARRAVIT VISVM NOBIS ET INTELLEGIMVS...

Now compare with this the Montanist visions in the Acta Perpetuae: Perpetua's vision (c. iv.) concludes with the words

et retuli statim fratri meo et intelleximus passionem esse futuram = κα εὐθέως διηγησάμην τῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ ἐνοήσαμεν ὅτι δέοι παθείν κτέ.

Again, in c. viii. the visions concerning Dinocrates end with the same terms

καὶ ἐνόησα ὅτι μετετέθη ἐκ τῶν τιμωριῶν=tunc intellexi translatum eum esse de poena.

So in c. x. (Vision of the Wrestling-Match) we end with et experrecta sum: et intellexi, etc. = καὶ ἐξυπνίσθην· καὶ ἐνόησα κτέ.

It seems then that there is a close parallel in manner between Perpetua's account of her visions and the interpolating hand in the Pauline vision.

One other parallel to the Martyrdom shall be given from the glosses of the Acts. In Acts iv. 24, when the apostles return from the Sanhedrin, the interpolator tells us that the Church recognized the operation of a Divine Energy in what had occurred:

oi de akoycantec kai emignontec thn toy $\overrightarrow{\theta_Y}$ enepgeia ad illi cvm avdissent et cognovissent di virtyte,

Compare with this the effect which the prison-life of the Martyrs of Carthage produced upon their keepers; it runs in Latin as follows:

c. ix. Deinde post dies paucos Pudens, miles optio, praepositus carceris, qui nos magni facere coepit, intellegens magnam virtutem [Dei] esse in nobis.

The Greek is as follows:

καὶ μετ' ὀλίγας ήμέρας Πούδης τις στρατιώτης ὁ τῆς φυλακῆς προϊστάμενος μετα πολλῆς σπουδῆς ἤρξατο ήμᾶς τιμᾶν καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν ἐννοῶν δύναμιν μεγάλην εἶναι περὶ ήμᾶς.

Now I think it will be admitted that this passage in the Acts of the Martyrdom is decidedly Montanistic; that it was so felt and understood may be seen from the fact that the Greek text has been slightly reformed, as by reading $\pi\epsilon\rho i$ $\hat{\eta}\mu\hat{a}_{S}$ for $\hat{\epsilon}\nu$ $\hat{\eta}\mu\hat{\nu}$, and by the addition of $\tau\hat{\delta}\nu$ $\theta\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\delta}\nu$. But the idea of the indwelling energy is Montanistic.

The conclusion which we draw from the series of coincidences here described is that the Western text of Luke and the Acts is a Montanist text, earlier in date than the time of Perpetua, and that it was a familiar subject of study amongst the Carthaginian Martyrs. Whether this implies a local origin for the text must not be hastily decided; for it is probable that all the three Churches, Rome, Carthage and Lyons, Montanized in the second century.

CHAPTER XV.

FURTHER PROOFS IN THE TEXTUAL INTERPOLATIONS OF THE THEORY OF LATINIZATION OF THE BEZAN TEXT IN THE ACTS.

WE have shewn reason to believe that the Codex Bezae is a Montanist Ms., basing our conclusion upon observed phenomena in the Gospel of Luke and in the Acts of the Apostles. But now let us see whether these interpolations were first made on the Greek or the Latin side of the text. Happily the very first case that presents itself in the Acts is a crucial instance. In order to elucidate it we will transcribe Acts i. 2, in the Greek and Latin:

αχρι ης ημέρας ανέλημφθη εντειλαμένος τοις αποςτολοίς Δια πης αγίογ ογς εξέλεξατο [και εκέλεγςε κηργοσείν το εγαγγελίον]

where we have bracketed the words which constitute the gloss.

The Latin is

VSQVE IN EVM DIEM

QVEM SVSCEPTVS EST QVO PRAECEPIT APOSTOLIS
PER SPM SANCTVM QVOS ELEGIT [ET PRAECEPIT
PRAEDICARE EVANGELIVM].

Now, in order to clear up some of the confusion, observe that quo in the second line of the Latin is merely a wrongly inserted correction for the erroneous quem at the beginning of the line. Probably a conjunction has been displaced by the quo (? et).

In the next place observe that the commentator, in order to make clear what it was which our Lord enjoined upon His disciples, adds the words

et praecepit praedicare euangelium.

Obviously this gloss was in Latin, praecepit occurring in the text as the word to be explained, and appearing again in the commentary. The Greek then has taken the Latin back by a new translation without any regard to the equivalence between the first praecepit and the Greek verb $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\rho\mu\alpha\iota$.

But if this was a Latin gloss, we shall only find it in Latin copies, or in those Greek copies whose ancestry passes through the

first form of Codex Bezae.

Now, the addition is found either wholly or in part in Augustine, in Vigilius Tapsensis, in the Sahidic Version and in the Luxeuil Lectionary: i.e. we have a Gallican Lectionary of the earliest period, an Egyptian Version, and two African fathers of the fifth century. It must be owned that this is very instructive; we are not surprised at the conduct of the Sahidic version, for we detected this in the transference of a Latin hexameter in Luke; but we are at first a little surprised at the wide area of country covered by the reading. The Sahidic text probably is based ultimately upon a Roman original: D and the Luxeuil Lectionary are Gallican; and the fathers quoted would most likely get their texts by way of Carthage. Is it possible that an interpolated text could spread so far?

There are two more glosses on the same page, probably by the very same hand:

Acts i. 5.

KAI O ΜΕλλΕΤΑΙ λΑΜΒΑΝΕΙΝ ET EVM ACCIPERE HABETIS,

which is attested by Hilary, Augustine, Maximus of Turin, and the Toledo Lectionary.

And in the same verse

εως της πεντηκόςτης VSQVE AD PENTECOSTEN

is attested by Augustine and the Sahidic version.

We note again the concurrence of these last two authorities.

Just in the same way as we recognize a Latin hand in the glosses in the Acts by means of the word *praecepit*, common to the text and the gloss; so we can detect some other instances of the same workmanship.

In Acts v. 39 the words are added

ΟΥΤΈ ΥΜΕΊΟ ΟΥΤΈ ΒΑΟΙΛΕΊΟ ΟΥΤΈ ΤΥΡΑΝΝΟΊ __ ΑΠΕΧΕΌΘΑΙ ΟΥΝ ΑΠΌ ΤωΝ ΑΝθρώπων ΤΟΥΤώ NEC VOS NEC IMPERATORES NEC REGES DISCEDITE ERGO AB HOMINIBVS ISTIS.

Now, here the last line is a recapitulation from the 38th verse, and it is in the Latin that the repetition occurs, and not in the Greek, as we may see by comparing the text with

Acts v. 38,

attocthie and twn andpwhwn toytwn discedite ab hominibus istis.

The gloss is then a Latin one, and evidently by the same hand as before: its Greek is merely a re-translation.

A similar argument applies to Acts vi. 10, where the words

OITINEC OYK ICXYON ANTICTHNAI TH COΦIA QVI NON POTERANT RESISTERE SAPIENTIAE

are repeated at the end of the verse in the form

NON POTENTES AVTEM RESISTERE VERITATI,

and done into Greek with a new word $d\nu\tau o\phi\theta a\lambda\mu\epsilon\hat{\imath}\nu$ for $d\nu\tau \iota\sigma\tau\hat{\eta}\nu a\iota$ (the former word may itself be borrowed from the xxviith chapter), so that we have

τη ούςη εν αυτώ και τω πνί τω αγίω ω ελάλει μη δυνάμενοι ου αντοφθάλμειν τη αλήθεια,

where $o\vec{v}$ stands for $o\vec{v}\nu$.

But if this verse be glossed by a Montanist, as we suggested above with regard to the words $\tau \hat{\eta}$ o $\mathring{\sigma} \eta$ $\mathring{\epsilon} \nu$ $a\mathring{\upsilon} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ and $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\mathring{a} \gamma \mathring{\iota} \varphi$ then we may say that the rest of the matter added to the verse is by the same hand. We also include in the list of Montanist glosses the other words which intervene and which made the repetition necessary

ΔΙΑ ΤΟ ΕΛΕΓΧΕCΘΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥC ΕΠ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑCHC ΠΑΡΡΗCIAC QVONIAM PROBATUR ILLIS AB ILLO CVM OMNI FIDUCIA.

But this expression $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{a}$ $\pi\dot{a}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\pi a\rho\rho\eta\sigma\dot{a}\varsigma$ is frequently inserted as a gloss in the text: is it then a Montanist expression?

Now, in the Acts of the Apostles the gloss appears again in ch. ix. 20: though this part of Codex Bezae is missing; for we can restore it by means of Irenaeus' quotation of the passage, which undoubtedly comes from the same text-tradition;

ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, φησὶν, ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐκήρυσσε [μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας] τὸν Ἰησοῦν=in synagogis, ait, in Damasco praedicabat [cum omni fiducia] Iesum.

Harvey II. 63 = Mass. 197.

And it appears also in the gloss added in xvi. 4,

META ΠΑCHC ΠΑΡΡΗCIAC TON KN IHN XPN
AMA ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΤΈC
CVM OMNEM FIDVCIAM DNM IHM XPM
SIMVL TRADENTES.

But the recognition of this gloss concerning the delegates from the Church at Jerusalem as Montanistic probably carries with it the two similar glosses, in which the attempt is made to improve upon the unspiritual decrees of the Jerusalem Council by the addition of some evangelical expansion. And this consideration carries us to Acts xv. 29, where we had already recognized the words φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἀγίφ πνεύματι as being Montanistic, and must now ascribe to the same hand the insertion of the famous sentence.

καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἐαυτοῖς γείνεσθαι ἐτέρφ μὴ ποιεῖν.

And we have also Acts xv. 20,

καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἐαυτοῖς γείνεσθαι ἐτέροις μὴ ποιεῖτε,

the Greek forms of the two passages being a little nearer together than the Latin.

It is becoming, by this time, clear that there is an internal connexion between the greater part of the glosses in the Acts. The supposition is not an unnatural one, and it is interesting to see how capable of confirmation it is. There is a suspicious

family resemblance in the character of the glosses, in the language in which they were made, and in the copies, versions and fathers that attest them. A number of these witnesses have already been alluded to; but we may further note that a gloss in iv. 32, which appears to belong to the same family, is attested by DE, Cyprian, Ambrose and Zeno, while in the previous verse another gloss has the support of DE, Irenaeus and Augustine, where again it is certainly the original text of Irenaeus and not a translator's addition.

In v. 38, to which we have alluded above, the added words are attested by DE 34. In v. 39, the gloss is attested in some form or other by DE, *demid.*, the later Syriac, Cod. 180 and the margin of Cod. 33.

In vi. 10, we apparently have for the first gloss in the verse DE; then DE and the Luxeuil Lectionary. Then DE and the margin of the Heraclean Syriac: and last of all DE, the Heraclean margin and the Bohemian version.

The famous gloss at the end of xv. 20 brings together D, Sahidic version, Ethiopic version, and eleven cursives, together with Irenaeus. While in xv. 29, the first part of the gloss brings together very nearly the same attestation with the addition of Cyprian: and the last part brings in Irenaeus and Tertullian.

Numbers of similar coincidences of attestation may be found: but we need not record them all. It has always been recognized that there was a peculiar affinity between certain members of the various classes mentioned above. But it becomes intelligible now that we have seen reason to suspect that these glosses, or at least a great part of them, are due to a single hand, and that probably the hand of a Latin Montanist.

We have no hesitation in saying that the influence of this Latinized and Montanized copy is to be seen in the following copies, versions and fathers.

DE, tol., luxov., demid., Sahidic, Heraclean Syriac (and its marg.), Bohemian, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Hilary, Zeno, Maximus Taur., Vigilius Taps.

No doubt it may seem, at first sight, rather absurd to suppose that the errors of a single copy could spread so far as Poitiers, Lyons, Turin, Verona, North Africa and Egypt; to which must probably be added Sardinia which is supposed to be the birthplace of Cod. E, and perhaps even Spain; but this is just the point that always is hard in connexion with the Western text: the way to understand it is by recognizing that the errors in question are undoubtedly errors of a great antiquity, and, if that is not sufficient to explain their diffusion, we must go further and shew that they occurred in or near the centre of ecclesiastical distribution for Latin texts: and we must examine the errors in question carefully with a view to recognizing the locality to which they originally belong.

CHAPTER XVI.

RELATIONS OF THE BEZAN TEXT TO THAT USED BY IRENAEUS.

But if the Codex Bezae was in Lyons as far back as the sixth century, as we have tried to prove by a variety of considerations, it was presumably copied from an earlier bilingual, also in Lyons: and although suspicions have arisen in our mind that the ultimate origin of the Bezan tradition is Cisalpine if not African, yet we have still to ask the question as to the time that the Lyonnese succession has been kept up. How far back does the Gallican history of the Ms. go? Are we to say with Scrivener that "it is, on the whole, an independent translation made either directly from the Greek on the opposite page, or from a text almost identical with it; that the translator often retained in his memory, and perhaps occasionally consulted, both the Old Latin version, and Jerome's revised Vulgate; and that he probably executed his work in Gaul about the close of the fifth century!"?

Each of the three statements is probably an error: the translation was, indeed, made from a companion Greek text, but not the Greek text as now read in the Ms., for this has been harmonized with the Latin, to say nothing of some other changes which have crept into it. The translator not merely remembers the Old Latin version; he is himself the author of the Old Latin version; the reference to Jerome is probably a delusion; last of all, the translation is much older than the fifth century, as we have by this time pretty well proved.

¹ p. xxxi. Cf. p. lxiv, 'We assign to the Latin version of Codex Bezae a western province (most probably Gaul) and a date not higher than the fifth century.

Or shall we follow Dr Hort's theory which makes the Codex Bezae a product of the fourth century? Its structure he describes as follows: "The Greek text of Codex Bezae is substantially a Western text of cent. ii. with occasional readings probably belonging to cent. iv.¹," while in speaking of the Latin versions he says, "In the fourth century we find current in Western Europe, and especially in North Italy, a second type of text the precise relation of which to the African text of the second and third centuries has not yet been clearly ascertained²."

I take this to mean that the Latin of Cod. Bezae, which has such close affinities with Codices Vercellensis and Veronensis and the MSS. used by Ambrose, is substantially a fourth century text. Its method of composition is described by Dr Hort as follows³:

A genuine (independent) Old Latin text has been adopted as the basis, but altered throughout into verbal conformity with the Greek text by the side of which it was intended to stand. Here and there the assimilation has accidentally been incomplete, and the scattered discrepant readings thus left are the only direct Old Latin evidence for the Greek text of the New Testament which the bilingual Mss. supply. A large proportion of the Latin texts of these Mss. is indeed, beyond all reasonable doubt, unaltered Old Latin; but where they exactly correspond to the Greek, as they do habitually, it is impossible to tell how much of the accordance is original and how much artificial; so that for the criticism of the Greek text the Latin reading has here no independent authority.

Now if our investigation shews anything it proves that the artificial agreement of which Dr Hort speaks is due to a specific cause, viz. Latinization of the Greek text; and that consequently it is the Bezan Latin that is of prime importance⁴, while the Greek has no certain value except where it differs from its own Latin, and must not any longer be regarded as an independent authority. And if the Greek be thus relegated to a secondary position, the case not only calls for a re-statement of the theory as to the building of D, and of the date of the translation, but it brings up another question with it, that namely of the Bibles respectively in use

¹ Introduction, p. 148.

² Introduction, p. 78.

³ Introduction, p. 82.

⁴ Consequently Tischendorf was right when he said, Cod. Sin. proleg. p. xxxii. note 2, "Italus ejusdem codicis textus (sc. D) a quo ipsum Graecum pependisse certum est etc."

by Irenaeus and his translator. Dr Hort explained the wonderful agreement between the Latin of Codex Bezae and the Latin of Irenaeus (for there are many cases in which the translator of Irenaeus is nearer to the Latin of D than to the Greek) by representing the Bezan Greek as co-eval with Irenaeus. and the Bezan Latin as belonging to the time of his translator. And this led him to deny Massuet's theory that the text of Irenaeus was translated before the end of the second century and was, in fact, in the hands of Tertullian. Accordingly we find him saving¹, "We are convinced not only by the internal character of this biblical text [i.e. the text followed by the translator], but by comparison of all the passages borrowed in substance by Tertullian....that the true date of the translation is the fourth century." This I take to mean that the Bezan Latin being of the fourth century (as seen from its concurrence with the great North Italian texts), the Latin quotations in Irenaeus are very largely Bezan Latin. I shall attempt to shew that this conviction is a misapprehension; and shall take the Bezan Latin, which we have seen to be the real authority, right back to the time of Irenaeus, instead of to the fifth century, as Scrivener suggests, or to the fourth, as Hort allows: and I shall try to take the translator of Irenaeus back with him, for the sake of companionship.

It is admitted then in the first place that there is a wonderful concurrence between the Biblical text of Irenaeus and the text of Codex Bezae. They combine, especially in the Acts, in readings that are nowhere else found, and which are so obviously erroncous that it would be absurd to deny genealogical contiguity to the texts that contain them, especially when, as in the present case, geographical contiguity has been practically proved. Perhaps the most conspicuous instance of all these is a coincidence in the Latin in Acts iii. 14,

YMEIC ΔΕ TON AΓΙΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΕΒΑΡΥΝΑΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΗΤΗCΑΤΕ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΦΟΝΕΙΑ VOS AVTEM IPSVM SANCTVM ET IVSTVM GRABASTIS ET POSTVLASTIS VIRVM HOMICIDA,

¹ Introduction, p. 160.

which Irenaeus quotes as1

vos autem sanctum et iustum aggravastis et petistis virum homicidam.

Now, concerning this peculiar reading, we first find out its origin, which was as follows; observe that the Greek text as generally edited reads

ηρνήσασθε καὶ ητήσασθε,

while D reads in the second place $\mathring{\eta}\tau\mathring{\eta}\sigma a\tau\epsilon$, probably for the sake of a more exact agreement with its Latin. But at some period in the transcriptional history this $\mathring{\eta}\tau\mathring{\eta}\sigma a\tau\epsilon$ perhaps written as a marginal correction of $\mathring{\eta}\tau\mathring{\eta}\sigma a\sigma\theta\epsilon$ affected the first word $\mathring{\eta}\rho\nu\mathring{\eta}\sigma a\sigma\theta\epsilon$, which was sufficiently like to it in appearance, and the latter was read as $\mathring{\eta}\tau\tau\mathring{\eta}\sigma a\tau\epsilon$ by the insertion of a single letter. The translator did his best with this $\mathring{\eta}\tau\tau\mathring{\eta}\sigma a\tau\epsilon$ and gave it a signification, which it has in later Greek, so as to mean "ye insulted (or slighted) the holy one and the just &c."; for this aggravastis was a very good rendering: but, as was to be expected, the revising hand took the Greek to task for insufficient correspondence and wrote $\mathring{\epsilon}\beta a\rho\acute{\nu}\nu a\tau\epsilon$.

Now of this error we say that, although it was primitively a Greek error, yet, as far as our text goes, it is a Latinizing error, and the Latin text has precedence of the Greek. But the translator of Irenaeus had this rendering, though unfortunately there is no Greek text extant at this point by which we could determine whether Irenaeus read $\hat{\epsilon}\beta a\rho\dot{\nu}\nu a\tau\epsilon$. Lastly, Augustine was under the influence of it, for Tischendorf quotes the text

· Aug. Pecc. mer. 28 inhonorastis et negastis,

which would seem to shew that Augustine used a text in which aggravastis had been corrected to a more conventional word.

Whether, then, our explanation of the origin of the error in this passage be correct or not (and we shall draw attention in a future chapter ² to another solution of the difficulty which has been proposed) it is clear that the text of the Codex Bezae at this point is closely related to that of the Latin Irenaeus; and since the instance quoted is only one out of many similar

¹ Ed. Harvey, II. 55 = Mass. 194.

cases, we are warranted in describing the two texts as genealogically contiguous. And this means on the one hand that, if the translation of the Codex Bezae were made in the fourth century, then the translation of Irenaeus cannot have been made in the second; and on the other hand, if the Codex Bezae is proved to contain a Latin text of the second century, there is no à priori objection to the theory that the translation of Irenaeus belongs to the same century, and in fact there is no objection at all provided only that reasonable grounds be asserted for such a belief.

Now the difficulty of the case lies in the relations between the Greek and Latin of Irenaeus. So little of the Greek of Irenaeus is preserved, that in appealing to the evidence of that father, we are liable at any moment to the counter-assertion that the text is not really that of the Greek, but is merely an expansion or alteration of the translating scribe. And even in those readings which may safely be carried back to the original text of Irenaeus, we have to prove not merely that the Codex Bezae and Irenaeus are in agreement, but that they are in agreement in Latinized readings, if we are to shew that the translation in the Codex must be earlier as to its origin than the great work on Heresies.

Perhaps the simplest way to resolve the difficulty is to confine ourselves to the glosses in the manner suggested in the last chapter; for these glosses have a frequent internal nexus which betrays a common hand, and the evidence of one gloss in a group can be used to confirm the evidence of another in the same group. And moreover it is precisely in the matter of expansions of the current text that we are safest in arguing from the text of the translation to the original Greek of Irenaeus; for, while a scribe may translate a biblical text which he finds before him in the language with which he is familiar, he is very unlikely to complicate his rendering by additional sentences from his own copy of the scriptures. We say then, (i) that the Biblical glosses in the Latin Irenaeus are probably to be referred to Irenaeus himself; (ii) where these glosses shew a Latin origin (since Latin glosses imply a Latin text), they are decisive as to the antiquity of the Latin translation.

Take, for example, the glosses which describe the freedom of

speech which the apostles experienced under the influence of the Holy Spirit; and which consist in the insertion of the terms μετὰ παρρησίας, μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας, cum fiducia, cum omni fiducia; which certainly betray a single hand.

In Acts vi. 10, where Codex Bezae makes the addition, the

passage is not quoted at all by Irenaeus.

In Acts ix. 20, the page of Codex Bezae is lost, but the passage is quoted in Irenaeus, and the same gloss occurs, and at this point happily the Greek text of Irenaeus is extant as well as the Latin: we have as follows (II. 63 = Mass. 197).

ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, φησίν, ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐκήρυσσε μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι οὖτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Χριστός.

=In synagogis, ait, in Damasco praedicabat cum omni fiducia Iesum, quoniam hic est Christus filius Dei.

In Acts xvi. 4, we find the same gloss in Codex Bezae, where it forms a part of a longer passage, in which the glossator has attempted to reform the unspiritual character of the decrees of the Jerusalem Council:

Now since these three Western glosses are due to the same hand, we infer that they are earlier than Irenaeus, who quotes one of them, and that they were extant in the early Western text, for the Codex Bezae has two of them (and probably had the third in the unmutilated form of the Ms.).

This group of glosses was, therefore, in the Western text before the time of Irenaeus.

The only question that remains is that of Latinity; were they

originally made on a Latin copy?

Now there is nothing in the words themselves that is decisive one way or the other: $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{a}$ $\pi\dot{a}\sigma\eta$ \$ $\pi a\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\eta\sigma\dot{\epsilon}a$ \$ might just as easily be inserted in a Greek tradition as cum omni fiducia in the Latin; but in the context there is much that is indicative of Latin hands. We have already pointed out that in Acts vi. 10 the remainder of the gloss of which we have quoted part is certainly Latin. And we have further shewn that there is reason to connect these glosses with others in the Acts which are clearly the work of a Montanist

interpolator, the greater part of whose insertions, if not the whole of them, were certainly made in Latin.

We conclude, then, that the Western glosses in question were extant in Latin before the time of Irenaeus. Even where we are not able to say decisively that the glosses in the Acts come from a Latin original, we are able to prove their antiquity, which makes it so much easier for us to argue from their occurrence in the Latin of Irenaeus to their existence in the lost Greek.

For instance it is not at first sight easy to determine whether the gloss in Codex Bezae Acts xv. 29,

φερομένοι εν τω αρίω πνευματί ferentes in santo spo,

is from a Latin or Greek original; but since it is found in Tertullian (De pudic. 12) in the form

rectante (=vectante) vos spiritu sancto,

and in Irenaeus' Latin in the form (II. 70 = Mass. 199)

ambulantes in spiritu sancto,

we need not hesitate to refer the use of the gloss to Irenaeus himself. And, indeed, it will be found generally true that the glosses of the translator of Irenaeus were in the text which he worked upon. The preserved fragments of the Greek text confirm us strongly in this belief. For instance in Acts iv. 31 we find in Codex Bezae the gloss

TANTI Τω ΘΕΛΟΝΤΙ ΠΙCΤΕΥΕΊΝ OMNI VOLENTI CREDERE.

This passage is preserved in the Greek of Irenaeus as well as in the Latin; and the words are extant in both, although Harvey, following Massuet, declines to print them as a biblical quotation. If the Greek of Irenaeus had been lost at this point, we should, perhaps, have had difficulty in making people believe that the added words belonged to Irenaeus himself. But they are fortunately preserved, and we have one more proof of the safety in reasoning from the gloss of the translator's text to the gloss of his copy. Moreover in this case, we are fortunate in being able to detect the hand that made the gloss: for the favourite expression of the author of the group of glosses which we were

just now discussing occurs as a part of the genuine text at this very point:

мετα παρρησίας παντί τω θελοντί πίστεγειν.

We can hardly doubt that it was the sight of this favourite expression which inspired the glossator at this point to add a few more words by way of explanation.

Again why should we hesitate, when we find Acts iii. 17 quoted in Irenaeus (II. 55 = Mass. 194) in the form

secundum ignorantiam fecistis nequam,

to carry back the nequam to his Greek text, which unfortunately is lost? But this word is clearly due to the Latin translator of the Acts, who, in rendering κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε, disliked to have an active verb in his text without an object; and so inserted a word, which was promptly reflected on the Greek. Hence in Codex Bezae we have

per ignorantiam egistis iniquitatem,

the primitive form being doubtless nequam. Does not this look like a Latin addition to the text of the Acts? Many similar cases might, no doubt, be brought forward. But perhaps we have said enough, in view of the proved pre-eminence of the Latin of Codex Bezae over the Greek, in view of the proofs and suspicions of Latinity in the glosses of the Acts, and the certainty that some of them were extant in the Greek of Irenaeus, to convince our readers that the Western bilingual is not a fourth century product but that it goes back to the times before Irenaeus and before Tertullian. Whether any readings of later times may be current in Codex Bezae is, of course, an open question: but the actual translation and many of the glosses of the translation seem to belong to the period which we have indicated.

We will examine presently the whole body of these glosses in the Acts in a special chapter. Now let us turn to the question of the Latin of Irenaeus. If our reasoning be correct, it is no longer necessary to regard this as a fourth century product. Are there any reasons for referring it to an earlier period?

Let us then say a few words about Massuet's theory that the Latin translation of Irenaeus was known to Tertullian. The point is not exactly material to our argument, but it is an interesting one. If we are wrong, it will be easy for Dr Hort or some other scholar who holds with him to put us right.

I take it that the translation of Irenaeus was made either in Lyons, Rome or Carthage: the problem is thus very like the one of determining the original home of the Western bilingual. But Carthage is, perhaps, excluded by the fact that Africanisms do not seem to have as yet been adequately proved in the text. A translation, however, which was made either at Rome or Lyons would rapidly pass to the sister Montanist Church, and furnish the material for any quotations made by Tertullian. There is nothing, then, in the nature of an à priori objection against Massuet's theory. The case for that theory is stated as follows by Harvey':

Internal evidence persuades the judgment that Tertullian wrote his treatise c. Valentinum after A.D. 199, with this version before his eyes: Massuet's comparison of the two texts in his second dissertation is very convincing: when the translator trips, Tertullian also stumbles; and too many minute peculiarities of nomenclature and style are found to agree in both, to be the result of accident. Cyprian possibly², and Augustine certainly, copied this version³.

The evidence of Augustine is admitted, and we may turn to Cyprian: the extract is as follows:

Cuius [Marcionis] magister Cerdon sub Hygino tunc episcopo, qui in urbe nonus fuit, Romam venit; quem Marcion secutus, additis ad crimen augmentis, impudentius caeteris et abruptius in Deum Patrem creatorem blasphemare instituit.

With which we have to compare the Latin of Irenaeus:

Et Cerdon...occasionem accipiens cum venisset Romam sub Hygino qui nonum locum episcopatus per successionem ab apostolis habuit...Succedens autem ei Marcion Ponticus adampliavit doctrinam, impudorate blasphemans eum qui a lege et prophetis annunciatus est Deus.

It seems evident that Cyprian has been reading Irenaeus either in the Greek or in the Latin; or in the Greek as quoted by Hippolytus⁴.

¹ p. clxiv. ² Ep. ad Pompeium (de Cerdone).

³ C. Iulian. Pelag. 1. 3, 7.

 $^{^4}$ I suppose we should correct ηὔξησε διδασκαλεΐον of Hippolytus into ηὔξησε διδασ-

Now we have seen that in some form, either Greek or Latin, the works of Irenaeus were current in North Africa before Cyprian's time, and it is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that Cyprian is referring to Irenaeus: and Massuet says bluntly that Cyprian knew no Greek. Dr Hort would seem to believe the same, when, after speaking of the way in which Tertullian's Scripture quotations are complicated by independent translations from the Greek, he remarks¹, "This disturbing element is absent, however, from Cyprian's quotations, which are fortunately copious and carefully made." But if Cyprian was not in the habit of using the Scriptures except in the African Latin form, still less is he likely to have consulted the original Greek of Irenaeus.

I do not, however, lay any stress on the fact that Cyprian agrees with the translator of Irenaeus in making Hyginus the ninth bishop of Rome, where we should, from Irenaeus' statement elsewhere, have expected eighth, for the recovered text of Irenaeus in the *Philosophumena* shews the same reading in Greek. On the whole, however, there is a fair possibility that Cyprian used a Latin Irenaeus.

This brings us very near to Tertullian; and we may say that the only objection to Massuet's theory is that Tertullian seems to have often translated independently from the Greek in the case of the New Testament, and therefore any coincidence which may be found in his extracts from Irenaeus with the Latin translation, made at Lyons or Rome, may be purely accidental. Let us see then whether Tertullian is translating entirely de novo. We admit that in handling the New Testament he was fond of "immediate and original renderings, the proportion of which to his quotations from the existing version is indeterminate but certainly large"."

For instance, we find in Irenaeus³ that the translator had to deal with the sentence

ο ἐνήρξατο μὲν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Νοῦν καὶ τὴν ᾿Αλήθειαν, ἀπέσκηψε δὲ εἰς τοῦτον τὸν παρατραπέντα.

κάλειον if we are to retain an agreement with the Latin. Irenaeus must surely mean that Marcion exaggerated the teaching of Cerdon: and so does Cyprian.

¹ p. 78. ² Hort, Introd. p. 78.

³ Ed. Harvey, I. 14 = Mass. 8.

He renders it as follows:

quae exorsa quidem fuerat in iis quae sunt erga Nun et Alethiam; derivavit autem in hunc [Aeonem, id est Sophiam] demutatam, (l. demutatum):

where a reference to the Latin of (309 I. = Mass. 130), "audent dicere, quia a Logo quidem coepit, derivatio autem in Sophiam," shews that there is no doubt about the reading, derivatio in this case standing for $d\pi \delta \sigma \kappa \eta \mu \mu a$ or $d\pi \delta \sigma \kappa \eta \psi \iota s$.

Now, according to Stieren, this is not the right rendering: "haec vox non respondet graecae ἀπέσκηψε. Vertendum erat irrupit seu incidit." If Stieren be right it is curious that Tertullian should translate in the same way. But whether it be a right translation or not of the medical term used by Irenaeus, and we are not disposed to support Stieren's objection, it is certain that Tertullian uses the word, and not merely uses it, but explains it, just as one explains a word in a difficult text, and just as one does not do in making one's own translations with any degree of freedom. Accordingly Tertullian says "in hunc autem id est Sophiam derivarat, ut solent vitia in corpore alibi connata in aliud membrum perniciem suam efflare." If Tertullian had been translating de novo he would not have needed this long explanation of the obscure translation; nor would be have added the other gloss "id est Sophiam," for he would have simply translated in hanc, with or without the addition of Sophiam. The fact is, he had a rude rendering to handle, and just as later copyists inserted in Irenaeus the explanation (Aeonem, id est Sophiam), so Tertullian adds id est Sophiam. He may even have found the gloss already in his Latin text.

No doubt much more might be said in favour of the opinion that Tertullian glosses, comments on and amends an already existing text. He could not have done otherwise with a barbarous Gallic or Vulgar Latin version, and we ought not to be surprised at the treatment. We are disposed then to believe that Massuet's theory, to which we refer the reader, may after all be true, and that the Latin version of Irenaeus found its way very early into the library of the Church of Carthage.

CHAPTER XVII.

RELATION BETWEEN THE TATIAN HARMONY AND THE BEZAN TEXT.

WE have now shewn reason for believing that the whole body of Western Latin readings go back into a single bilingual copy, the remote ancestor of the Codex Bezae: and we have also seen that the Greek of the Beza text owes the greater part of its textual and grammatical peculiarities to the reflex action of its own Latin.

We have also furnished material for a very decided belief that this peculiar revised Greek or its Latin, and perhaps both of them, passed into Egypt, presumably to Alexandria, and there became the parent of one at least of the corrupt Egyptian versions, viz. the Thebaic or Sahidic.

So that it is not at all surprising if the belief should expand to a conviction that Western readings are to be looked for in Alexandrian Codices; and that not because of the great antiquity and consequent world-wide diffusion of Western readings, but simply because Rome is the ecclesiastical parent of Alexandria.

But it will be said that this suggestion is nullified by the fact that the Syriac readings present the same eccentric forms and features as the Western Latin texts; and surely, it will be said, no one can possibly maintain that the Syriac versions date from any such origin as a Graeco-Latin bilingual. Let us then examine a little into this point, and without prejudice: the New Testament criticism is so full of burning questions that we must be careful not to anticipate solutions; but it also bristles with unsolved problems, so that we may be prepared for surprises.

The Syriac texts of the New Testament are usually reckoned to be a series of successive revisions, the two earliest forms being the so-called Curetonian Syriac or Old Syriac, and the Peshito Syriac or Syriac Vulgate. Closely connected with these is the Harmony of Tatian, which has recently been recovered in an Arabic version and was already known by the extracts from it and the running commentary made upon it by Ephrem the Syrian. This Harmony then was current in the second century, and it is certainly very closely related to the Old Syriac and the Vulgate Syriac.

The prevalent belief as to the true relation between them is that the Harmony is the elder, and that the Old Syriac of Cureton stands in relation to it just as one of the Old Latin versions might stand to a primitive Latin Harmony; only its relation may be closer than that, for it is suspected that the Old Syriac may have been constructed indirectly out of the very fragments of the Harmony by a scribe who was perfectly familiar therewith. However that may be, we have to ask ourselves the explanation of these Eastern-Western readings. And we must interrogate them until we get a series of satisfactory answers, which may lead us to a hypothesis that is adequate for the explanation of the known coincidences between the readings.

We begin with John xvi. 21, which appears in Ciasca's Latin translation from the Arabic in the following form

"Mulier enim, cum ei appropinquat tempus pariendi, opprimit eam adventus diei partus eius."

Now the following considerations will shew that Tatian used a text in which was the word $\hat{\eta}\mu\hat{\epsilon}\rho a$ instead of $\mathring{\omega}\rho a$. First the words adventus diei partus convince us of this: and next, a reference to the critical apparatus shews the same reading in

D 248 a b c e ff 2 and syrsch,

the latter version, which probably derives ultimately from Tatian, shewing the words which are equivalent to dies parturitionis. So that Tatian and the Peshito agree in their text at this point, and the reading is a conspicuously Western one: it has only two Greek texts chronicled for it by Tischendorf, and of these one is conspicuously Latinized. The reading then is a decidedly

Western one: it belongs to that errant crew which we have so often detected in following the primitive Latinized bilingual. Does it not seem as if the translator of this text had used a translator's freedom and paraphrased the expression "the woman's hour," and explained it by "the day of parturition," or at all events had translated \Ho ρa as if it were \Ho $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \rho a$? But if this be so, Tatian has used the primitive bilingual or some associated text. It is even conceivable that he never used a Greek text at all; but only a Latin copy.

The second instance to examine is one to which allusion has already been made; I mean the reading $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ for $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\sigma\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ in Mark ix. 15, where the corrupt Greek is read by D and supported by b c ff^2 i k, and the Arabic is represented by prae gaudio properantes.

Did Tatian use a Greek copy which had the corruption? It is certainly possible, though perhaps not likely, when no other Greek traces of the reading are forthcoming than those in D; on the other hand, if he used a Latin copy, the error was not only possible, but almost inevitable; for we may easily see that the error must have been, at first, universal in Latin texts. Certainly in this case the probability is in favour of a Latin original.

Now let us turn to Luke xxi. 25,

kai eti the the cynoxh e θ n ω n et svper terram conflictio gentivm.

So the text runs in Codex Bezae.

The word $\sigma v v o \chi \dot{\eta}$ was not a very easy one to render, but I think it will be admitted that D has made a very spirited translation, carrying with it the idea of the hurling together of masses of men in battle. Codex Vercellensis renders it compressio, Brixianus occursus, others pressura, as if the Latin versions had found especial difficulty with the word as it stood in the Greek or in the first Latin rendering. Now, the Curetonian Syriac and the Peshito have given us words equivalent to

complosio manuum gentium,

and that this stood originally in Tatian may be derived, not merely from the coincidence of the Old and Vulgate Syriac texts, but from the conflate text which appears in Ciasca's edition et in terra pressura gentium et frictio manuum prae gemitu sonitus maris etc.

Here pressura gentium stands for $\sigma v v o \chi \dot{\gamma} \ \dot{\epsilon} \theta v \hat{\omega} v$; but frictio manuum is the equivalent also of $\sigma v v o \chi \dot{\gamma}$, as may be seen from the Cureton text; the text is therefore conflate, and the correct reading is frictio manuum gentium. But how does this manuum come in? Evidently it must have arisen, not from the Greek $\sigma v v o \chi \dot{\gamma}$ which might easily have found an equivalent, but from a reviser's reflection upon the spirited word conflictio. Conflictio of what? and the imagination suggested the completion of the elliptical expression by means of the word manuum.

Does not this look as if the archetype from which Tatian made his mosaic was a Latin or Latinized text?

Now let us turn to Luke v. 8. In the Beza text it stands

λεγων παρακαλω εξέλθε απ εμού dicens rogo exi a me.

Here the word 'rogo' is a translator's addition to the Latin: it occurs elsewhere in our text as an expansion: for instance there is Acts xxi. 39, where $\delta \acute{\epsilon}o\mu a\iota$ is rendered by rogo observo, and a number of similar cases may be pointed out in the Old Latin.

Now, the word in the passage quoted from Luke goes back into the Greek, and it appears in the Old Latin authorities, as c e f.

But it is clearly a Western reading of an early type; we may say then, when we find it also in the Peshito, that it probably came there by way of Tatian, and a reference to Ciasca's Latin shews us

Domine, peto a te, ut a me recedas.

We are disposed, then, to the belief that Tatian has here absorbed a Latin reading, nor is our conviction sensibly weakened by the fact that the reading turns up also in the Gothic version.

In Mark i. 13 we find Codex Bezae reading

προς την θγραν αγτογ αD ιΑΝΥΑΜ εινs,

and supported in the added word $a\vec{v}\tau o\hat{v}$ by $c f f^2 g^1 q$. We should certainly be disposed to call this a genuine Western reading: but notice that it is in Tatian in a slightly modified form

et erat omnis ciuitas congregata ad ianuam Jesu.

In John xiii. 14 D reads

ποςω μαλλον και γμείς οφείλετε αλληλων νιπτείν τούς ποδάς.

Here the words $\pi \acute{o} \sigma \varphi \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ are due to the free translation of the Latin scribe who gave

QVANTO MAGIS ET VOS DEVETIS INVICEM LAVARE PEDES.

But this reading acquired great Latin currency, for we find it in $a f g^2 g$, &c.

It appears also in the Peshito Syriac, which must have derived it ultimately from Tatian, for Ciasca's Latin has

quanto magis aequum est etc.,

and the text of the early Syrian father Aphraates had the same or similar prefixed words.

Again, we see that the phenomena are explicable by the use of a Latinized text on Tatian's part.

In John xiv. 9 the Latin of the Beza text is against the Greek in reading

et non cognouistis me philippe.

The error was an extremely easy one in the Latin text, a mere matter of a single letter; but it spread widely, for it is in

$$abcfff^2eq$$

and the Vulgate, in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hilary and Novatian.

Surely this is a distinctively Latin reading, and not the less so because we find it in the Ethiopic version. Observe then that Tatian had the plural (teste *Ephrem*²); and the Latin of Ciasca is *nondum cognovistis me*.

Now let us look at Luke xxiv. 29. The Bezan text is

MEINON MEθ ΗΜώΝ ΟΤΙ ΠΡΟΌ ΕΌΠΕΡΑΝ KAIKÂEIKEN Η ΗΜΈΡΑ MANE NOBISCYM QVIA AD VESPERVM DECLINAVIT DIES.

² Zahn, p. 206.

¹ Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, p. 203, gives "wie müsst dann ihr etc."

Notice here that at the beginning of the second line $\kappa a i$ has dropped before $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \iota \kappa \epsilon \nu$ (read by itacism as $\kappa a \iota \kappa \lambda \iota \kappa \epsilon \nu$). Under the influence of this error $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\iota} \nu$, which stood at the end of the first line, has been removed from the Greek text. Accordingly the Latin texts $a b c e f ^2 l$ represent a text from which $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\iota} \nu \kappa a i$ is absent. Surely this is an error which may properly be called Western; because the Latin texts all agree in dropping the repeated syllable $\kappa a i$, and no other Greek authority than D is found for the reading. Now, the Tatian text as given by Ciasca reads

Mane apud nos quia dies iam declinauit ad tenebras,

and the Curetonian Syriac shews the influence of a similar reading.

We say then that the influence of the Western bilingual is perceptible in the Tatian text. The same thing is true of the associated Curetonian version; for example

In Luke xxiii. 39 Codex Bezae reads

ΟΤΙ ΕΝ Τω ΔΥΤω ΚΡΙΜΑΤΙ ΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΙΟ ΕΌΜΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΙΟ ΜΈΝ ΔΙΚΑΙωΟ ΑΣΊΑ ΓΑΡ ωΝ ΕΠΡΑΣΑΜΈΝ ΑΠΟλΑΜΒΑΝΟΜΈΝ

QVONIAM IN IPSO IVDICIO
ET NOS SVMVS ET NOS QVIDEM
IVSTE DIGNE ENIM SECVNDVM QVOD EGIMVS
RECIPIMVS,

Now here the Greek text has dittographed the words $\kappa a i \, \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} i \hat{s} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ and made $\kappa a i \, \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} i \hat{s} \, \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ out of them, which the Latin renders, omitting the superfluous word ϵi . The addition has affected Cod. C, the Sahidic and Coptic versions, and the Curetonian Syriac.

Reviewing the instances which have here been given, we see that the Western text which Tatian used was not merely a Greek text into which transcriptional errors had crept, but a text which had stood in a bilingual copy and had been affected by its accompanying translation. For some of the errors in Tatian are Latinizing errors. But if this be true for a single one of the errors examined, we are obliged to admit that a Latin translation of the Gospels already existed in Tatian's time; and that being so,

we conclude further that the text which Tatian employed was either an early Latin text, or the Greek of an early bilingual text. The two hypotheses are not so very far apart; and either can be supported from the phenomena exhibited by the variants of Tatian's text: upon the whole, I incline to think that a Latin text was employed. But it is not necessary to be too decided on this point, until further evidence is produced. We shall discuss in a separate chapter the cases where the pleonasms of the Latin translator have been projected on the text of Tatian.

The conclusion to which we have been led is an astonishing one: the hydra-headed Western text has been resolved into a single form; that form is the primitive Western bilingual; its apparently Eastern character is a delusion, for the Old Syriac texts lean on a Graeco-Latin, and perhaps simply on a Latin base. That the Sahidic version, and other Egyptian attestation, sometimes complicates the question by an apparently greater geographical distribution than would seem to be possible for truly Occidental readings, is an illusion arising from the fact of our ignorance that the Sahidic version demonstrably has stolen Latin readings. The Western text is now no longer the 'conceivably apostolic' edition which Dr Hort suggests, but it represents the successive translations and retranslations of actual Occidental tradition.

This text was translated into Latin before the time of Tatian, and the primitive bilingual in which the translation stood is a document of a patriarchal dignity and largely capable of restoration. We will presently proceed to intimate where this translation was made.

But before going further we must ask a similar question to the important one which occupied us in relation to the Latin translations; the question of reflex action. If either the Greek or the Latin of the Western text passed into Syriac, was there any reaction from the Syriac on the Greek or Latin?

CHAPTER XVIII.

DOES THE CODEX BEZAE SYRIACIZE?

Those who have, like ourselves, sought to explain the perplexing textual anomalies of the Western readings, have generally fallen back either upon the hypothesis of reflex Latinism or upon reflex Syriasm. And it has usually happened that the Syriac hypothesis has been taken up, because the Latinizing theory was supposed to be no longer tenable.

Certainly it is not a theory against which we ought to be prejudiced in advance. There are some things in the New Testament that perhaps will never yield to any other mode of elucidation. Take for example Mark viii. 10, which in Cod. D reads

και ηλθέν εις τα ορια Μελεγαδα ET VENIT IN PARTES MAGIDAN.

Here most early texts give us $\Delta a \lambda \mu a \nu o \nu \theta \dot{a}$, so as to read $\mathring{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \dot{l} s \tau \dot{a} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta \Delta a \lambda \mu a \nu o \nu \theta \dot{a}$.

But since the letters $\lambda \mu a \nu o \nu \theta a$ are an almost exact transcript of the Syriac for $\epsilon i s \tau \dot{a} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta$, we have a text which is equivalent to

Kharsh Kharsh,

and it is clear that the text is dittographed and that the real name has dropped out.

If this explanation be the right one, we have lighted upon a case in which all Greek Mss. except D have a Syriac error! An astonishing thing, but not an impossibility.

Let this instance suffice to shew that it is by no means an unreasonable thing to look for Syriac corruptions in the New Testament text.

Such a suspicion is confirmed when we turn to history: the Western Church, especially in Gaul, was constantly and from the first under Oriental and Greek influences. First and foremost amongst these influences was the presence of traders. Let us look at what Salvian of Marseilles (writing in the fifth century) says about that city ¹.

Nam ut de alio hominum genere non dicam consideremus solas negotiatorum et siricorum² omnium turbas, quae majorem ferme civitatem universam partem occupaverunt, si aliud est vita istorum omnium quam meditatio doli et tritura mendacii, aut si non perire admodum verba aestimant quae nihil loquentibus prosunt.

And that this influence of Eastern traders is not limited to Marseilles and the neighbourhood may be seen from the stories in Gregory of Tours: for example, a Syrian trader got himself appointed bishop of Paris, apparently by unfair means, and when elected applied to the Church offices the principle that 'to the victor belong the spoils.' Accordingly Gregory tells us ³

Ragnimodus quoque Parisiacae urbis episcopus obiit. Cumque germanus eius Faramodus presbiter pro episcopato concurreret, Eusebius quidam negotiator genere Syrus, datis multis muneribus, in locum eius subrogatus est; isque, accepto episcopato omnem scole decessoris sui abiciens, Syros de genere suo eclesiasticae domui ministros statuit.

The same Gregory of Tours tells us ⁴ that he translated the story of the Seven Sleepers into Latin by the aid of John the Syrian: "quod passio eorum, quam Siro quodam interpretante in Latino transtulimus, plenius pandit"; but it is difficult to determine from what language the translation was made. Under the date A.D. 585 ⁵ he relates an account of the entry of the king into the city of Orleans, and of his being met by a crowd of people carrying banners and singing in the language of the Latins, the Syrians, and even the Jews ⁶.

- ¹ Salvian, De Gubern. Dei, IV. 14.
- ² Rittershusius suggests sericorum, but it is more likely syrorum.
- ³ Greg. Tur. Bk x. p. 438 (ed. Arndt et Krusch).
- ⁴ Greg. Tur. Glor. Mart. c. 94. ⁵ Bk viii. p. 326.
- ⁶ "Sed cum ad urbem Aureliensem venisset, erat ea die solemnitas beati Martini, id est quarto nonas mensis quinti. Processitque in obviam eius immensa populi turba cum signis adque vixillis, canentes laudes. Et hinc lingua Syrorum, hinc Latinorum, hinc etiam ipsorum Iudaeorum, in diversis laudibus varie concrepabat, dicens: Vivat rex, regnumque eius in populis annis innumeris dilatetur."

The only difficulty with such statements is that of determining whether the term Syrus means anything more than a Greek. It is certain that the Oriental influence in Gaul, say in the fifth century, was very great; but they do not seem to have discriminated much between the various Eastern nationalities. Occasionally we meet with more specific statements. For example, there is the case of St Abraham, of whom Sidonius Apollinaris gives us an account. This good man came to France from the East, probably from the kingdom of Persia, having fled from the persecutions brought on the Christian people beyond the Euphrates by King Isdigerdes (A.D. 420). He settled not far from Clermont, and built a church in honour of Saint Cyriacus, where miracles were performed after his death, if we may believe Gregory of Tours. Here then is a bona-fide case of an Eastern ascetic, a Syrian, transplanted into the very region to which our manuscript belongs: and we have no doubt that many more such cases occurred, and that communications between the East and the West were even more open in the first centuries of the Christian era than they are to-day.

There is nothing, then, which is à priori absurd or difficult in the theory that Syriac texts may have re-acted on the Western texts from which they were derived, whether those texts be found in Gaul or elsewhere. We are not limited to any possible influence of the immediate school of Irenaeus and his successors. Even political influences come to our aid in this investigation; for, as Duchesne points out², we have to bear in mind that many reunions of Oriental bishops took place in Milan in the fourth century, and in particular that Auxentius, who was bishop of Milan from A.D. 355—374, was a Cappadocian.

In dealing then with the Codex Bezae, which was certainly in Gaul in the sixth century and whose text may be under ancestral Gallican influences for some time before the sixth century, even if the translation itself be not primitively Gallican, we hold ourselves at liberty to use with freedom the hypothesis of Semitic re-actions on a Greek text.

¹ Sidonius, ep. 17; Tillemont, xvi. 257; Stokes, Ireland and the Celtic Church, p. 173.

² Revue Critique for 15 July, 1890.

It is interesting to notice that a similar question has come up in connexion with the translation of Irenaeus and with the text of Irenaeus himself. Harvey, for instance, claims for Irenaeus "a respectable knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, and a very perceptible familiarity with the Scriptures of the New Testament in a Syriac version." He even goes so far as to suggest that the name Irenaeus may be a substitute for some Semitic name; and says2: "S. Irenaeus, who was of eastern extraction, had in all probability a more familiar acquaintance in his early years with some Syriac translation than with the Greek original of the Scriptures of the New Testament." Accordingly he makes many attempts to shew how the Western readings of Irenaeus' New Testament are to be arrived at by the process of corruption of Syriac texts: for example, in the opening words of Irenaeus' preface the expression λόγους ψευδείς και γενεαλογίας ματαίας αίτινες ζητήσεις μάλλον παρέχουσι is brought into harmony with the current Greek texts of the New Testament by equating ματαίας = ἐν αἶς ματαιότης = μπλ κάπλος = μπλ άμλ κους, which isthe Syriac equivalent for $d\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{a}\nu\tau\sigma\nu\varsigma$. And he applies the same method more or less successfully in a number of other cases.

I do not however see that his method is very different from the general attempt to explain Western readings in the New Testament by means of Syriasms. It has been recognized that many of what are called Western readings are just as much Eastern readings; they are supposed by Dr Hort to have had their origin in Asia Minor, while we, for our part, hold that they are truly Western: whichever of these hypotheses be correct, the affinity between the text of the Old Syriac and the Diatessaron of Tatian, and the so-called Western Greek and Latin versions, is so decided that they have to be treated together. Consequently there have from time to time been suggestions made that the texts of the New Testament which we call Western contain a Syriac element, which is something different from the Aramaisms that may have coloured the speech of the primitive evangelical writers; an element which can be eliminated, and by the study of which we can explain the occurrence of some at least of the

¹ Harvey, Irenaeus, p. cliii.

² p. 1, note.

primitive and perplexing forms in the early text of the New Testament.

Now, this hypothesis is a very inviting one and has engaged the attention of a number of writers, especially those who desired to explain the text of the Codex Bezae. For example, a reference may be made to I. D. Michaelis' *Introduction to the N. T.*, and the notes of Herbert Marsh on the same 1, from which we will quote a sentence or two by way of illustration. Michaelis speaks of the probability that

The Syriac has had an influence on the Latin, especially in those examples where an error is committed that might happen more easily to the Syrian than the Latin translator. The Latin text is properly a composition of several ancient Latin versions, one of which must have been made by a native Syrian, as appears from the Syriasms found in the Latin text of several ancient Mss. that greatly exceed in harshness the Syriasms of the Greek Testament: this Syriac translator was probably guided, in obscure passages, by the version of his own country, the effects of which appear to this very day in the Vulgate.

But Michaelis does not push this theory to an extreme, for he recognizes that

The wonderful harmony between the two most ancient versions of the New Testament, one of which was spread throughout Europe and the north of Africa, the other propagated from Edessa to China, could have had no other cause than similarity of the Greek Mss. in the West of Europe and the East of Asia.

Since Michaelis wrote these words the textual affinities have become more decided by the discovery of older forms of the Syriac version, yet it cannot be said that his hypothesis has been confirmed or demonstrated.

Another hypothesis nearly related to that of Michaelis is that of Schulz, who in his discussion of our MS.² maintained

Etiam Graecum codicis D sermonem ab interpretatione aliqua eaque Orientali (forsan Syra) primitus pependisse, aut eiusmodi versionem in exarando hocce libro...una cum Graeco quodam antigrapho adhibitam fuisse. Nam alia ratione sumpta haud facile crediderim solvi posse cuncta, quae libri mira indoles divinationi nostrae obiicit, aenigmata.

¹ Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. II. part 1, p. 26.

² Disputatio de Codice Cantabrigiensi, Wratislaviae, MDCCCXXVII. p. 16.

Schulz, then, in modern language maintains that the Western Greek text, as exhibited by D, is corrected from or conflate with a Syriac copy. But he does not do more in illustration of his thesis than collect a number of readings in which D and the Peshito Syriac agree. He could scarcely get to the heart of the mystery that way.

Now, when we note these suggestions which are made in the hope of explaining Western readings, we ought to ask whether there is any promise of the obtaining of any further light in this direction, or whether, on the other hand, the idea of Syriac reaction upon Greek and Latin texts ought to be dismissed with as much confidence as we should, for example, dismiss the opinion of Kipling and Schulz that the Codex Bezae was written in Egypt, or Bengel's view that it was related to the Anglo-Saxon.

Now it seems to me that the best way to approach such an enquiry would be to examine the Codex Bezae for individual Syriasms, rather than for coincidences of reading with Syriac versions; just as we began our study of the Old Latin text by detecting some of its archaisms.

For instance, when in John xi. 14 we have Lazar for the translation of Lazarus, and note the same error in the Old Latin Cod. a, which perhaps derives it from the same source as d, we may say that there is either a Syriasm or a Hebraism in the text, and apparently on the Latin side of the house. In Luke xiii. 14 again we find in die sabbat, which need not be a scribe's blunder. When we find in Luke ix. 1, και εξουσιαν επι πασαν δαιμονιον we suspect that the feminine adjective is due to the Semitic; in fact the Curetonian text has in this place woi. When, again, we frequently find the scribe of D spelling camellus instead of the conventional form, both in Greek and in Latin, and remember that the last letter of the Hebrew 22 is a double letter, we might perhaps suspect Semitic influence; but on the other hand observe it is the spelling of the Lyons Pentateuch and of some Romance languages.

In Acts xiii. 6 we have

ONOMATI KANOYMENON BAPIHCOYA NOMINE QVI VOCATVR BARIESVAM,

and the form of the name suggests at once a Syriasm both in the text and in the rendering. The true reading in this passage is very difficult to determine, but it seems as though some copyists had taken offence at the name $\beta a \rho \iota \eta \sigma o \hat{v}_{\hat{s}}$ in such a connexion and had deliberately changed it, something in the same way as the Rabbis changed Moses into Manasseh in the account of the idolatrous priest in the Old Testament; accordingly the Syriac version reads \sim or son of the Name. In the West, however, it seems to have been held sufficient to change the common Greek form $\iota \eta \sigma o \hat{v}_{\hat{s}}$ to the Semitic form. There are, then, at least shadowy hints of non-primitive Syriasms.

Now let us turn to a more decisive instance:

In John xi. 54 we have

αλλα απηλθέν εις την χωρά Cανφογρείν εγγς της έρημος εις έφραιν λεγομένην πολίν

SED ABIIT IN REGIONEM SAPFVRIM IVXTA DESERTVM EFREM QVAE DICITVR CIVITAS.

On this curious reading Dr Hort remarks as follows: "perhaps a local tradition, though the name has not been identified with any certainty. Sepphoris is apparently excluded by its geographical position."

It would be extremely interesting if tradition had here preserved the name of our Lord's brief sanctuary in a time of increasing hostility on the part of the Jewish rulers; but we are inclined to suspect that $\sum a\mu\phi o\nu\rho\epsilon\ell\mu$ is a mere corruption from the Syriac words answering to "whose name is Ephraim"; it is easy to see how a Syriac text which contained the words

لحبيده معدم محنيم

could be read as "the city of Samphurim."

Nor is this a mere random conjecture; notice how artificially the word has been thrust into the text so as to lengthen the line unreasonably, so that we might call it both in appearance and in matter a conflate text. And then let us pass on to another precisely similar instance. In Ephrem's commentary on Tatian's Harmony¹ we find "Patres nostri in hoc monte adoraverunt.

¹ Ed. Moesinger, p. 142.

Haec de Jacob et filis ejus dixit, quia in Monte Sichem aut in Bethel aut in Monte Samgriazim adorarunt." Ephrem is commenting upon the verse John iv. 20, and he is in some confusion as to the identification of the mountain, as to whether it be the mountain of Shechem which might mean either Ebal or Gerizim, or whether it means Bethel, or the mountain Samgriazim. Now this is a similar case to the preceding, and involves a misunderstanding of the Syriac words "whose name is Gerizim,"

הצובה שונה

Of course it is possible that in either of the cases we have mentioned the letters $\sum a\mu$ might be the first syllable of a lost $\sum a\mu a\rho ia$, but the concurrence in error is so peculiar that we can hardly accept such an explanation, against the simple and natural one given above.

In this last case Mar Ephrem is evidently perplexed about the name which, if his text had been quite clear, would have needed no comment; that is, he found it in the text upon which he had been working, and we have therefore to suggest that Tatian had inserted the name of the mountain in his text. Such a proceeding would be quite in harmony with many of his other expansions and elucidations of the Scripture. But this drives us back to the first case; for the two belong so suspiciously together that we are obliged to ask whether $\sum a\mu\phi ov\rho\epsilon i\mu$ is not also a corruption of a Tatian text. And this leads us again to the wider question; has the Tatian Harmony in any way reacted on the Western text? and are any of the assimilations or conflations in D due to reflex action from this source?

In Acts xiv. 27 we have

anh preidon oca o θc etto ih cen ayto ic meta twn $\psi \gamma \chi \omega n$ ayt ωn ,

where the reading has every appearance of conflation and is singular to our Ms. The ordinary reading $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $a\dot{v}\tau o\hat{\iota}\varsigma$ seems to have been replaced by $\mu\epsilon\tau'$ $a\dot{v}\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$, which passed into the Syriac as for $\mu\epsilon\theta'$ $\dot{\epsilon}av\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$, and has come back to reside in a literal translation in the Greek text.

These are the principal traces of actual Semitism which we

find in our Ms. Such as they are, they are either the accidents of a Semitic hand or they are reflex actions from the Tatian Harmony. It does not seem as though they constituted a general solution to the New Testament text riddle.

If we had not known that the Ms. was French, we might possibly have urged that the use of de for a genetive was a form of speech to which a Semitic hand was disposed: cf. the Syriac use of the prefix \mathbf{a} . Or we might have drawn attention to the use of the prosthetic vowel which prevails in Syriac as widely as in old French (e.g. for $\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\sigma\nu$, for $\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\sigma\nu$, for $\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\sigma\nu$, for $\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\sigma\nu$ for $\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\sigma\nu$, for $\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\sigma\nu$ for $\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\nu$ for σ

If we had not known, by examination, the extent to which the Latin had re-acted on the Greek, we should perhaps have been tempted with Kipling to scent Semitism in the recurrence and superfluity of the connective $\kappa a\ell$. But we see clearly that it arises from the translation of a participle and finite verb by two verbs with a conjunction, which said conjunction has a trick of returning on the Greek text. As to the instances brought forward by Michaelis and Harvey, they deserve a closer examination. Perhaps the best of them are as follows.

In Mark i. 41^{1} the reading καὶ ὀργισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ is explained by a confusion between which would give the necessary σπλαγχνισθείς.

We are convinced, however, that the real explanation is something much more simple; it arose out of a misunderstanding of the African Latin *motus*, which was ambiguous in its meaning. If the reader will refer to the Acts of Perpetua he will find two instances of the use of the word. In c. 3 we have

"tunc pater motus in hoc verbo"

where the corresponding Greek is $au a \rho a \chi \theta \epsilon i \varsigma$, and in c. 13

"et moti sumus et complexi illos sumus,"

¹ Marsh's Michaelis, II. 233.

where the Greek is $\sigma\pi\lambda a\gamma\chi\nu\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon$ s. The word might be used both of passion and of compassion.

We may be sure then that the primitive Latin text was motus, which was misunderstood by some later readers, and a correction imported into the Greek. We have a modern instance of the very same peculiarity in Zahn's recent restoration of the text of Marcion¹. Zahn quotes from Tertullian the following remark on Luke xiv. 21, "Hoc ut patrifamiliae renuntiatum est, motus tunc (bene quod et motus, negat enim moveri deum suum, ita et hoc [v. l. hic] meus est), mandat de plateis et vicis civitatis facere sublectionem": and having established the word motus for Marcion's text, which certainly looks as if Tertullian were quoting from a known Latin version, Zahn goes on to say: also sicherlich nicht ὀργισθείς. Accordingly he projects back an impossible $\kappa\iota\nu\eta\theta\epsilon\iota$ s upon Marcion's text. A beautiful but unnecessary instance of modern Latinization!

In Acts iii. 14,

ymeic be ton afion kai dikaion ebapynate

VOS AVTEM IPSVM SANCTVM ET IVSTVM GRABASTIS,

it is proposed to explain the reading by a change of its (negare) to (gravare). The reading is an important one², on account of its occurrence in Irenaeus; we have already endeavoured to explain it in a previous chapter as a Latinization of a misread Greek text.

In Acts iii. 17,

οτι γμείς μεν κατά αγνοίαν επράξατε πονήρο ωςπερ και οι αρχοντές γμών

QVIA VOS

QVIDEM PER INORANTIAM EGISTIS INIQVITATEM SICVT ET PRINCIPES VESTRI,

where the ἐπράξατε πονηρόν is said to be for abzi, perhaps under the influence of in the next line. But here too

¹ Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons Bd. ii. Zweite Hälfte, 1 Abtheilung, p. 478.

² See Harvey, Irenaeus, 11. 55 = Mass. 194.

³ Harvey, Ibid.

we have probably nothing more than a reflex action from the translation into Latin.

Many other cases may be found in Michaelis and in Harvey, but they are by no means as convincing as one has a right to expect. (Harvey's textual criticism is never of a very high order.) We cannot then say that they or we have brought forward any clear evidence of wide-spread Syriacizing in the Codex Bezae. Sporadic traces there may be, and perhaps a few Tatianisms; but not much beside. The latter form of corruption may appear not only in the use of actual readings but perhaps also in the form of harmonistic confusion.

It is undeniable that there is a great deal of harmonistic error in the Codex Bezae. The only trouble in laying such errors at any individual door lies in the fact that all Harmonists are likely to make certain combinations, and to some of them a scribe is liable who never used a Harmony in his life. We will point out a few cases of this tendency, without any desire to draw an extreme conclusion from them.

In Luke xi. 30 there is added at the end of the verse,

και καθως ϊωνάς εν τη κοιλία του κητούς εγένετο τρις ημέρας και τρις νύκτας ούτως και ο ξίος του ανθρώπου εν τη γη.

The appendix is a somewhat rude representation of Matt. xii. 40, and can scarcely be in its primitive form, one would think. But, in any case, in Tatian the passage Matt. xii. 40 followed Luke xii. 30, as we may see by a reference to the Arabic version published by Ciasca.

In Luke xxiv. 1 we have the addition

ελογιζοντο εν εαγταίς τις αρα αποκγλίσει τον λίθον.

This is, perhaps, from Mark xvi. 3, and we notice that the Arabic Harmony puts the passages together:

Luke xxiv. 1,

portantes quae paraverant aromata:

Mark xvi. 3,

et dicebant in semetipsis quis revolvet nobis lapidem ab ostio monumenti.

Here D has the following of c and the Sahidic, and we should prefer to believe that the error had a Latin origin, so as to agree with a previously observed delinquency of this group. But, on the other hand, it may be harmonistic.

In Luke xix. 45 the text of D is very involved: he has expanded the account of the cleansing of the temple from John and Matthew; but this need not surprise us; for Tatian regards the account in John as the same as that in the Synoptics, and welds the two stories together. According to D then we have

ελθων δε εις το ιερον Ηρξατο εκβαλλειν τογς πωλογντας εν αγτω και αγοραζοντας και τας τραπεζάς των κολληβιστών __ εξεχεέν και τας καθέδρας των πωλογντω τας περιστέρας...

Here we follow Luke as far as $\pi\omega\lambda ο \hat{\nu}\nu\tau a\varsigma$, where it is pretty evident that the text of Luke ended; the next words answer to Matt. xxi. 12, καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν, but here something has dropped out, probably the words κατέστρεψεν (from Matt.) and ὧν τὰ κέρματα (from John ii. 15); ἐξέχεεν is from John, and the rest of the passage is from Matthew.

We can now compare with the Arabic Tatian which shews

et numularios quorum aes effudit et subvertit mensas et cathedras vendentium columbas.

It is then possible that a mental or an actual reference to Tatian, or to some other Harmonist, may be the cause of the expansion of the narrative.

The case of Luke xix. 27 is somewhat more difficult: we have Matt. xxv. 30 added at the end of the verse. Now, the Arabic Tatian carefully separates the two parables of the talents and the minae; but, on the other hand, Zahn seems to think that in the primitive Tatian they formed part of one account. Accordingly he shews how the passages run together in Ephrem's Commentary and in the Homilies of Aphraates. In particular the text of Ephrem

ran thus (Moesinger, p. 218), "Talenta sua...abscondit illud... auferte ab illo talentum...sint lumbi vestri praecincti...et accensae lucernae vestrae," where the beginning is from Matt. and the end from Luke. Now, if Tatian or some earlier Harmonist really joined the passages together, as we may well believe, we need not be surprised at the added verse in Cod. D.

Other instances for study, in the line of harmonisation, will readily present themselves. We will examine one further case before leaving the point.

Let us turn to Matt. xxvii. 8; we may verify the following statement from the forms of the Tatian Harmony that have come down to us, that Tatian not merely harmonised his four Gospels, but that he also expanded them, when he thought fit, from the Acts and Epistles. One such case is this apparently double account of the death of Judas, where Tatian appended the details which he found in the Acts ($\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma$ s), as a post-mortem experience. Thus in Ephrem's Commentary we have "abiit et se suspendit et mortuus est"; followed by references to Acts i. 18.

Now, when the scribe of the Bezan text copies Matt. xxvii. 8, he writes

propter quod appellatus est ager ille • echeldemach hoc est ager sanguinis • usque in hodiernum.

The peculiar spelling of echeldemach shews that we have here a transposition from the first chapter of the Acts: but this would be natural enough for Tatian, first, because we know he borrows from the account in Acts; next, because he was obliged to exhibit some such form in translating the Greek $\chi\omega\rho io\nu$ a $i\mu\alpha\tau\sigma s^{1}$.

Finally, it may be interesting to contrast the method of Tatian with that of the Western text; Tatian aims at supplementing the Gospel of Matthew from the other three: the Bezan text, which is conceivably Tatianized, makes its chief expansions in the text of Luke.

¹ I pass by the difficult question as to the form of the word: merely saying here that I believe the primitive form was חקל דמן the sleeper's field or κοιμητήριον, which in Galilean patois was pronounced nearly as אחקל דמא.

CHAPTER XIX.

Local Origin of the Primitive Western Text of the Acts.

AND now we have at last succeeded in tracking the Western corruptions to their origin. At least we have gone so far with the matter as to say that we know to what cause (viz. systematic Latinization) to attribute the major part of the variants in the Acts of the Apostles: and although there is still much to be said with regard to the variants in the Western Gospels, I think we may safely attack the question of local origins, keeping our attention chiefly on the text of the Acts, and avoiding hasty generalisations with regard to the other parts of the New Testament. We have shewn, as we believe, if the canon hold that community of reading implies community of origin, that the Old Latin texts are all from one fountain; however much they may have emended their Greek from their Latin, and translated and re-translated, they go back into a single root which we call the primitive Western bilingual. And this primitive bilingual must be very ancient. A study of its interpolations in Luke and the Acts shewed it to be a Montanist text, probably known to the Martyrs of Carthage. A study of the relations between D and the Sahidic version intimates that it passed through the hands of those persons who made the eclectic Egyptian copies and versions; this carries it back beyond the time of Origen, who may be responsible for Alexandrian textual eclecticism, and who in any case was probably one of the worst textual critics the New Testament has ever had. The coincidences between D and Irenaeus take us again to a primitive translation that cannot be as late as the end of the second century. And finally, an

examination of the relics of Tatian's Harmony and of the Syriac versions shews reason for believing that the bilingual, at least as far as concerns the Gospels, is older than Tatian¹.

But the actual determination of the local origin of the Latin text has been a problem that has hitherto defied solution; we must not even assume that the same origin will be the birthplace of the Latin Gospels and of the Latin Acts of the Apostles, nor that all the Gospels were primitively translated by the same hand and in the same place.

Now, the right way to settle such a question does not consist in citing puzzling remarks of Augustine as to the relative merits of Italian and African texts, and the superior verbal fidelity of the African rendering: these criticisms only result from Augustine's observation of discrepancy between texts current in North Africa and texts current in Italy in his own day: they are not scientific. It may be doubted whether Augustine or Jerome had the slightest idea as to where the New Testament was originally translated, or even that there was a single primitive translation. They merely saw a variety of types of Latin text around them, and they criticised them superficially and used them eelectically; Origen did much the same with the Greek texts in Alexandria.

One of the first suggestions to occur in such an enquiry as this is that we should test the various texts for Africanism. Indeed this is the only course open to those who undertake to

¹ It is pleasing to find that at this point my researches lead to the same conclusion as those of Resch. I am surprised at this, for in many points I suspect my results are fatal to some of his reasonings with regard to the uncanonical sources of the New Testament; but in the following points we seem to agree.

Resch, Agrapha, pp. 350, 351, "Es ist nämlich der Cod. Cantabr., oder vielmehr dessen Archetypus, mit welchem fast sämmtliche patristischen Citate, vorab sämmtliche lateinische zusammenhängen. Denn der Archetypus des Cod. D ist ohne Zweifel die Quelle der altlateinischen Versionen gewesen. Von diesen altlateinischen Versionen aber sind die lateinischen Autoren vor Hieronymus beherrscht, so namentlich Iuvencus, Hilarius, Augustinus......Nun es ist aber ausser Zweifel, dass der Archetypus des Cod. D, welcher bis in das zweite Jahrhundert zurückzudatieren ist, auf die vornicaenischen Väter griechischer Zunge, vorab Clemens und Origenes, wie überhaupt auf die Alexandriner, grossen Einfluss ausgeübt hat, dass er aber auch mit Tatian sich berührt, folglich bis in Iustins Zeiten seine Spuren zurückverfolgen lässt. Thatsächlich schrumpft also die grösste Zahl der griechischen und lateinischen Paralleleitate beinahe auf einen einzigen Hauptzeugen zusammen, welcher in einem Archetypus des Cod. D zu erkennen ist."

prove that the primitive text is African. It is not enough for them to say, as they do, that Tertullian evidently knew of a translation of the New Testament: for the underlying assumption that this translation could only have been made shortly before Tertullian used it is not verifiable, and indeed it is probably far from the truth. The search for individual Africanisms has not, however, been a very successful thing. Some persons deny altogether the existence of an African dialect distinct from the Vulgar-Latin. But such a position is hardly a tenable one: it is surely impossible that the Latin spoken in a Punic country should shew no variations of style or matter from the Latin spoken amongst the Celts or the Lombards.

The best investigation of the subject is that made by Sittl¹, who goes straight to the inscriptions for the peculiar forms of speech, and tests the literature by the inscriptions. But Sittl could find no satisfactory catalogue of Africanisms in the Old Latin texts, and while he admitted the substantial Africanism of some parts of the Latin Old Testament, and believed in the existence of a special version associated with Tertullian, he concluded that the so-called Italic version had its origin and home not in Africa but in Italy. He further conjectured that, if it had arisen in Rome, Augustine would have called it Romana and not Itala; and suggested some smaller Italian city—say Naples—as the centre of emanation of Latin texts. But, as we have already intimated, Augustine was not likely to know anything in the world about the primitive habitat of texts, so that this suggestion of Sittl is valueless.

On the whole we must admit that no very definite conclusions have as yet been reached, and I propose to begin the examination de novo, not with the hope of resolving the whole of the ambiguities of the ancient Western textual history, but because it is only by trying patiently to solve a part of the problem by a new examination, that the way can be made for some one else to solve the remaining part.

Let us begin then with the Western text of the Acts of the Apostles, and confine our attention for the present to that. When we say that it is an early text, and that it is a Montanizing

¹ Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache, Erlangen, 1882.

text and a Latinizing text, there is nothing decisive as to locality about either of these statements: but we cannot be far wrong in adding that this practically shuts us up, in seeking for the centre of textual distribution, to the three cities, Rome, Lyons and Carthage: because all these Churches have a strong Latin element, and all of them Montanize, the order of intensity being probably Carthage, Lyons, Rome: each city furnishing one noted teacher at least, who was tinctured more or less completely with the Montanist ideas, viz.: Tertullian, Hermas, and Irenaeus, the order of intensity being that of the names. But before we can get any further, we must examine the data of the case more closely.

We must not assume that these Montanist glosses are coeval or collocal with the primitive bilingual; but we may begin by saying that their distribution textually is very wide, and they must, as a body of glosses, be very early. Here we part company from Dr Salmon, who remarks that he has "found reason, on investigating the history of Montanism, which clearly is combated in the Muratorian fragment, to think that it did not make its appearance in the West until a little after the year 200²!"

If a single one of the group of Montanist glosses be traced in the text of Tertullian, and another in the text of Irenaeus, it would be enough to prove that the Montanist edition of the Acts was much earlier than the year 200, and what becomes then of the theory of third-century Western Montanism? The fact is that neither the history nor the character of Montanism is as yet properly understood; the eyes of even judicious critics having been dimmed through a long heredity of heresy-hunting. But, when we once realize the fundamental spiritual aims of Montanism (instead of merely treating it as an outward division of the Church), however much such aims may be liable to fanatical extravagance, a number of difficulties become clear to us in the history and discipline of the Church, to say nothing of the illumination thrown upon the text of the Codex Bezae. Every verse of the Old Testament, or of the New, which treats of the descent of the spirit of prophecy is a hinge in the Montanist system. If

We may limit the Montanism of Irenaeus to the earlier years of his life.

² Introd. to New Test. p. 62.

they read in the Old Testament that the Sophia enters into holy souls in all ages and makes them friends of God and prophets, this magnificent statement is the reason why S. Priscilla says that Christ appeared to her in female form and imparted to her the Sophia 1. The passage in the book of Wisdom is seen to be a key-text, and so, when the Montanist glossator comes to the statement in the Acts that the opposers could not resist the wisdom that was in Stephen, he felt constrained to add a few remarks about the Sophia, which, as an imparted principle, dwelt in Stephen. We must also have a regard to Montanist proof-texts in the New Testament: for here one of the fundamental texts is John xvi. 8. "The Paraclete shall convince the world." That is why the gloss in Acts vi. 10 adds the words "since they were convinced by Him," meaning the Holy Spirit, and not Stephen; "quoniam probatur illis ab illo." So that a study of a system of glosses like these in the Acts furnishes us with what we may call the quintessence of the Montanist theology.

No less light is thrown by the same study upon the difficult questions of textual criticism. Let us give a single illustration: the case of the famous interpolation (or omission) in John vii. 53—viii. 11. Dr Hort thinks that "few in ancient times, there is reason to think, would have found the section a stumbling-block except *Montanists* and Novatians²."

Evidently Dr Hort did not think that Montanist tampering with the text amounted to much; we on the contrary have found reason to believe that it was a very far-reaching influence: and that in the present instance the Montanist Churches either did not receive this addition to the text, or else they are responsible for its omission; but at the same time it can be shewn that they knew the passage perfectly well in the West; for the Latin glossator of the Acts has borrowed a few words from the section in Acts v. 18,

kai επορεγθή εις εκάςτος εις τα ίδια et abiervnt unusquisque in domicilia³.

¹ Cf. Origen, Homil. in Jerem. xiv. 5, τίς δὲ γεννᾶ προφήτας; ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλεγεν οὖν τό. Οἴμοι ἐγὼ μήτηρ, ὡς τίνα με ἔτεκες, ὧ σοφία;

² Introd. Notes on Select Readings, p. 86.

³ The origin of the gloss is confirmed by the words added a little lower down

I think it may be safely said that more than forty of the trouble-some glosses in the Acts of the Apostles can be set down with a confidence that borders closely on certainty to the hand of the Latin Montanist referred to above. And nothing can be more important for the acquiring of right views with regard to the genesis of New Testament readings than such a fact as this. For the attestation of such a group of readings is demonstrably capable of combination and can be replaced by a single factor; and the evidence of this single factor, when it stands by itself, is of the nature of a proved corruption.

The reader will be interested to work this point out for himself, and he will be surprised to find the power of this Montanised copy: he will find its influence in almost all Latin texts and fathers; he will trace it in Cod. E, which is probably a direct descendant of Codex Bezae, and in a stray cursive or two; he will find it in the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions, shewing that it passed to Alexandria; in the margin of the later Syriac, which represents a Greek MS. which Thomas of Heraclea consulted in Alexandria; and probably in the Syriac text itself, perhaps in both of its recensions, though this is a point which may require more examination. It will not, however, be found in the Great Uncials, nor in the ordinary Greek texts and fathers. Wide as its scope is, this text and its descendants are not universal in their influence. The lines on which it moves can be marked out, the areas over which it is current can be shaded in. And if this explanation be a correct one for the diffusion of the single group of readings referred to, then it is a vera causa for similar textual phenomena: and we say unhesitatingly that the occurrence of a given reading in

in the text; viz. $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon$ to $\pi\rho\omega$, which is an adaptation of John viii. 1. The man who made this addition not only knew the Gospel of John, but knew it in its (supposed) interpolated form. Moreover, it looks as though the interpolation was made from the Latin side. Thus our body of glosses furnishes important evidence for the *antiquity* of the doubtful section.

Those who are interested in this particular subject will find that the semi-Montanist Hermas knows the disputed section; for in the fourth Mandate, Hermas discusses the problem of the woman who has been convicted of adultery, and the duties of the husband and wife are laid down by the Shepher.l, who finally sums up his teaching by the words, οὐ δίδωμι ἀφορμὴν ἴνα αἴτη ἡ πρᾶξις οὕτως συντελῆται, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀμαρτάνειν τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα. The disputed section was therefore known in Rome and to Hermas.

Western texts and in the main body of the versions is no proof at all that the reading did not originate in Rome, or even Carthage, but rather is a suggestion to the contrary.

We have only dealt hitherto with those glosses and changes which may be considered to be demonstrably Montanistic; it is probable that a number of the remaining textual excentricities in the Acts may have to be set down to the same cause; for it is extremely unlikely that we should always have been able to detect the glossator at his work, or that his corrections should always have been so highly coloured as to be capable of immediate identification. In any case, it can be proved that a number of the remaining glosses are from a Latin hand, whether contemporaneous with the former or not. For example, the first four glosses in the Acts are as follows:

Acts i. 2 et praecepit praedicare evangelium [lux: sah: Aug: Vig. Taps.].

i. 4 de ore meo [lux: aeth: Aug: Hil.].

i. 5 et eum accipere habetis [tol: Aug: Hil: Max.Taur.].

i. 5 usque ad pentecosten [sah: Aug.].

Of these the first, third and fourth belong to the Latin Montanized edition. What of the second? Its attestation shews it to be as decidedly Latin as the first or third or fourth; in its nature it is evidently the mere paraphrase of a translator: we may conclude then that it is a Latin gloss: whether it be by the Montanist hand or not, we can scarcely venture to say dogmatically; but the attestation agrees very well with such a supposition.

This belief in the fundamental Latinity of many of the eccentric Bezan readings is confirmed in another way: just as we were able to prove the Montanist glossator to be a Latin by the fact of the repetition of a clause of his text in the same Latin but in a different Greek dress, so we can argue for a number of readings in which the glosses in the Bezan text appear in a different Greek form elsewhere, as for instance in the Codex Laudianus.

For example, in Acts ii. 13 the Latin gloss appears as in iudicium in e and in the Latin of Irenaeus, and in the equivalent in iudicio of d; but the Greek in Codices DE is different; eis $\kappa \rho i \sigma i \nu$ D; eis $\kappa \rho i \tau \eta \rho i \rho \nu$ E. Hence we see that the reading must be primitively Latin; and we shall probably be not far from the

mark when we say that Codex E is the resultant of two texts; one a Greek text, and the other the detached Latin of a bilingual.

Another good example is Acts v. 15, where we have

- D ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενίας ώς εἶχεν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν.
- Ε καὶ ρυσθώσιν ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενίας ης είχεν.
- d et liberabantur ab omnem valetudinem quem habebant unusquisque eorum.
- e et liberarentur ab omni valetudine quam habebant.

Here again it is clear that the Greek of E is a reformed rendering of what is substantially the same Latin as in the Bezan Codex.

Or we may examine Acts v. 38, where E has changed the $\mu\iota\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon_{5}$ $\tau\dot{\alpha}_{5}$ $\chi\epsilon\hat{\imath}\rho\alpha_{5}=$ non coinquinatas manus of D into $\mu\circ\lambda\dot{\nu}\nu\circ\nu$ $\tau\epsilon_{5}$ $\tau\dot{\alpha}_{5}$ $\chi\epsilon\hat{\imath}\rho\alpha_{5}=$ non coinquinantes manus. But this case is probably a part of a Montanist gloss which we have already discussed; so that we are the more sure here of the priority of the Latin.

It will be seen then by what precedes that the Latin origin of others of the glosses in the Acts, besides those which are more definitely Montanistic, can be clearly established ¹.

¹ The reasoning as to the fundamental Latinity of the Western text will apply also to those places in the Acts where the evidence of D, or of D and E, is not forthcoming, but where the attestation has otherwise the same constituents.

For example, when we find in Acts xxvii. 15 after $\epsilon \pi \iota \delta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon_s$ the addition $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \circ \nu \tau \iota \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota} \circ \nu \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\iota} \delta \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon_s$ as the eurious form $\pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \circ \nu \tau \iota$ for $\pi \nu \dot{\epsilon} \circ \nu \tau \iota$, which we recognize to be the Bezan form from Luke xii. 55 ($\kappa \alpha \dot{\iota} \circ \tau \alpha \nu \nu \dot{\iota} \circ \tau \tau \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \circ \nu \tau \alpha$). It stands, therefore, as the equivalent for the Latin flanti, and the three Greek MSS. 44, 112, 137, which testify in favour of $\pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \circ \nu \tau \iota$, may be assumed to have taken it from the same source, namely the glossed bilingual.

So much for the Greek spelling, which intimates a single Western copy, of the Bezan type. Tischendorf points out that the evidence of the Heraclean Syriac is for a text flanti et collegimus artemonem. Here again the combination of authorities is undoubtedly Western; but it cannot be the earliest form of the gloss, for flanti without a substantive makes no sense. It must therefore be a corruption for flatui (FLANTI=FLATVI). Accordingly we find in Bede the note "Haec alia translatio manifestius edidit: et arrepta navi cum non possent occurrere vento, commodata navi flatibus colligere vela coeperunt." The Greek text is therefore a literal trans-

With the view of confirming the reader's belief in the fundamental Latinity of these glosses, we will now draw attention to the remarkable results which follow from this analysis of the Latinizing factors, by turning to the passage Acts xiii. 12,

ιδων δε ο ανθύπατος το γεγονός εθαγμάς θ και επίστε γεθν τω θ εκπλης comenog επί τη δίδαχη του κύ τυνς cvm vidisset proconsul quod factum est miratus est et credidit in do stupens super doctrina dni.

First remark that the words $\partial \theta a \nu \mu a \sigma \epsilon \nu \kappa a \lambda$ and $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ are glosses. The latter is an obvious translator's expansion and presents no difficulty. But the former is more obscure. Following the line of our previous experience with the glossed text, we suspect that we have here a double translation (or else an African pleonasm) in the rendering of $\partial \kappa \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$ by miratus est and stupens. If this be the true explanation we shall probably be able to support it by similar usage elsewhere. Let us turn to the Codex Bezae in Matt. xix. 25: here we have

ακογςαντές δε οι μαθηταί εξεπλης conto και εφοβηθης αν ςφοδρα λεγοντές avdientes avtem discipuli stypebant et timuerunt valde dicentes.

lation of a misread Latin gloss. Other cases of the same kind can no doubt be given.

If the reader is interested in tracing the glosses to their common origin, he is advised to fix his attention closely on the pair of companion MSS. D and E, and to study their glosses side by side, as shewn above in our text. Another pretty case of the same phenomenon will be found in Acts xiv. 7, where D has

KAI ΕΚΕΙΝΗΘΗ ΟΛΟΝ ΤΟ ΠΆΗΘΟΟ ΕΠΙ ΤΗ ΔΙΔΑΧΗ Ο ΔΕ ΠΑΥΛΟΟ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΡΝΑΒΑΟ ΔΙΕΤΡΙΒΟΝ ΕΝ ΛΥΟΤΡΟΙΟ ET COMMOTA EST OMNIS MVLTITVDO IN DOCTRINIS PAVLVS AVTEM ET BARNABAS MORAS FACIEBANT IN LYSTRIS.

Ε reads τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ἐξεπλήσσετο πᾶσα ἡ πολυπληθία ἐπὶ τŷ διδαχŷ αὐτῶν· ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας διέτριβον ἐν Λύστροις, while his Latin is practically the same as that of D.

Now here the same verb $\hat{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\tau\tau\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ turns up, and again we have a gloss in the Greek text, viz. the word $\hat{\epsilon}\phio\beta\dot{\eta}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$. Evidently it is a case of double translation agreeing almost verbatim with the former case; and it is certain that the primitive Latin rendering was pleonastic, for on turning to Cod. Vercellensis we have mirabantur et timebant, and so in Cod. Veronensis: other Old Latin texts shew the same pleonasm, though some reduce it back to a single term, no doubt by omission of the alternative rendering.

But if this reasoning be correct, since the pleonastic translation is found in $Dubceff^2g^2$ it must be a part of the primitive rendering of the text of Matthew. And this arouses our suspicions that the original rendering in Matthew and the translation of the Acts are by the same hand; and that the particular gloss in the Acts of which we are speaking is due to the first translator.

Nor is this all: for the gloss in Matthew found its way into the text of the Curetonian Syriac, which gives

permy was very

So that we suspect that the Curetonian text was made from a Latinized copy. Moreover it is included in the preceding that the whole of the translation into Latin of the Gospels and Acts (more exactly, Matthew and Acts) is earlier than the Curetonian Syriac¹.

There are doubtless many other cases of these pleonastic translations in the Gospels (as distinct from conflations), and we can sometimes detect them by noticing that separate Latin copies take up detached parts of an extant pleonastic rendering. For instance, if we find in Codex Bezae the form possessionem heredetatis for $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\rho\nu\rho\mu\ell\alpha\nu$ (as in Acts vii. 5), we may be pretty sure that Cod. E which is related to D will drop one or other of the words, and, as a matter of fact, on turning to the Codex we find that he contents himself with hereditatem. No doubt there is much to be done in the study of the parallel Latin versions, with a view to the detection of the pleonasms and barbarisms of the first rendering. The foregoing instance is given, as has been said, merely as a suggestion of the right method of procedure, and of the results

¹ The Arabic Tatian in the parallel passage Mark x. 26 shews a similar rendering of $\xi\xi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu\tau\sigma$, admirabantur...iam timidi.

that will follow. For the present, however, all that we need to deduce from the study of the case with which we started is that it furnishes no exception to the theory that the major part of the glosses in the Greek text of the Acts are primitively Latin glosses.

One other remarkable case of Latin glossing shall be given, before we plunge deeper into the question of local and temporal origins for the Latin text of the Acts; it is the gloss in Acts

xii. 10:

et cum exissent descenderunt septem grados et processerunt gradum unum.

I must confess that there are few things that have so deceived me in the Bezan text as this gloss about the seven steps of the prison at Jerusalem has done. Its innocent touch of originality had almost led me to join Bornemann in his worship of the Western idol. But we are saved by the study of other passages, from which we have learned that we must not expect in such a text to find the footprints of a commentator who had been in the prison at Jerusalem and had counted the steps as he came out. And knowing, as we do, that in one passage at least, and probably in a number of others, in the Gospel of Luke the text has Homerized, we see our way to explain the perplexing interpolation. First, we fix our minds upon the Latin text, which is clearly not the same as the Greek. On the hypothesis that the Greek is a rendering of the Latin, we need not assume that it was necessary to write $\tau \circ \vartheta \circ \zeta' \beta a \theta \mu \circ \vartheta \circ :$ it will be sufficient to translate septem gradus without the article; 'they (Peter and the angel) came down seven steps and went on one step.' The writer is imitating Poseidon's descent from the mountains of Thrace (Iliad xiii. 17),

Αὐτίκα δ' ἐξ ὄρεος κατεβήσετο παιπαλόευτος Κραιπυὰ ποσὶ προβιβάς, τρέμε δ' οὔρεα μακρὰ καὶ ὕλη, Τρὶς μὲυ ὀρέξατ' ἰώυ, τὸ δὲ τέτρατου ἵκετο τέκμωρ.

And just as Poseidon makes his descent with a hop, skip and jump from Samos to Aegae, so rapidly does the angel carry Peter from the middle of the prison into the heart of the city. Notice the concurrence of the language,

κατεβήσετο = descenderunt = κατέβησαν.προβιβάς = processerunt = προσῆλθαν.

The change in the numbers, from three steps and a step to seven steps and a step, is suggestive of metrical exigency, just as we found in the passage borrowed from the story of Polyphemus, where twenty carts had replaced the two and twenty carts of Homer, in order to make a Latin hexameter. We may suspect then that here the same hand has been at work as we detected in the Gospel of Luke¹. It is a case of the use of a Latin metrical

1 It may be asked, what was it that provoked Homerization of the passage in the first instance? In the Polyphemus passage it is the cave and the great stone; but what was the motive here? I am inclined to believe that the first thing which drew the attention of the annotator was the abrupt introduction of the $\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\sigma$ Kvplov. To one accustomed to pagan literature this would easily recall Hermes; and that the writer did make the mental connection with the winged herald of the gods, will be seen from the fact that he immediately alters the text from $\pi\alpha\tau\dot{\alpha}\ddot{\xi}\alpha$ $\tau\dot{\gamma}\nu$ $\pi\lambda\epsilon\nu\rho\dot{\alpha}\nu$ $\tau\dot{\alpha}\hat{\nu}$ Il $\epsilon\tau\rho\nu$ to $\nu\dot{\nu}\ddot{\xi}\alpha$ s $\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ $\kappa\tau\dot{\epsilon}$ (=pungens autem latus Petri). In other words the $\ddot{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\sigma$ s wakes Peter by a thrust of his wand and not by a stroke of his hand. Readers of Homer will recall at once the conventional description of the $\ddot{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\sigma$ s.

είλετο δὲ ἡάβδον, τἢ τ' ἀνδρῶν ὅμματα θέλγει ὧν ἐθέλει, τοὺς δ' αὖτε καὶ ὑπνώοντας ἐγείρει· τὴν μετὰ χερσίν ἔχων πέτετο κρατὺς ᾿Αργειφόντης.

> (Il. xxiv. 343.) (Od. v. 47.)

This explains the perplexing $\nu \dot{\nu} \xi as$, of which I. D. Michaelis rightly said in his Curae in Versionem Syriacam, p. 107, "Hie sine dubio ex latinizante codice corruptus est Syrus. Cum enim solus Cantabrigiensis legat $\nu \dot{\nu} \xi as$, pungens, quam lectionem ex latinis patribus Lucifer Calaritanus expressit, Syrus habet $\vec{r} = pupugit$ illum atque ex ipso olim expresserat Arabs." Strange to say, Lagarde seems to have accepted $\nu \dot{\nu} \xi as$ as the primitive reading!

Returning to our commentator, the next thing that would strike him would be the directions given by the $\ddot{a}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\sigma_{s}$ $\kappa\nu\rho\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma$ to Peter; calcia te calciamenta again suggests Homer, and the idea that Peter and the angel are going to fly through the air: we have only to recall the description given by Homer of the flights of Pallas and Hermes:

αὐτίκ' ἔπειθ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα άμβρόσια, χρύσεια, τά μιν φέρον ἡμὲν ἐφ' ὑγρὴν ἡδ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν ἄμα πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο.

The escape of Peter was then a genuine flight, in which he was assisted (i) by the presence of the angel, (ii) by the use of his sandals. We are thus able to explain all the perplexing corruptions in the passage. They are due to a Homerizing Latin scribe.

text of the New Testament, or of glosses from a Latin translation of Homer. In any case, I think we may feel some confidence in the theory which asserts the priority of the Latin glosses over their Greek conjugates.

But ought we not to go one step further, though I can well imagine some one suggesting that the steps already taken are sufficiently Olympic, and may we not in the final stride perhaps touch the goal? The writer who inserted that picture of a flight from prison into the city lived in a place where the prison was high above the city, and overlooked it: how else could he have used the word $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\epsilon} \beta \eta$ or thought of Poseidon's descent from Olympus? He must have been in some city where people went up when they were committed to prison, and came down when they recovered their freedom. Such a case as that of S. Perpetua at Carthage suits the description, where the prison was on the Byrsa, hundreds of feet above the town, so that Perpetua describes the visit of her father to her in the words 'de civitate...ascendit ad me.' The suggestion, then, arises that perhaps the glossator in question was a Carthaginian. So we are brought back again to the question of the African origin of the Western text, and we must proceed to test for Africanisms, to the best of our limited ability.

Bearing in mind, then, the fundamental Latinity of nine tenths of the Western readings, let us turn to the gloss in Acts xv. 11,

CYNKATATEΘΕΜΕΝώΝ ΔΕ ΤώΝ ΠΡΕΟΒΎΤΕΡώΝ ΤΟΙΟ ΥΠΌ ΤΟΥ ΠΕΤΡΟΎ ΕΙΡΗΜΕΝΟΙΟ DESPONENTES AVTEM PRESBYTEROS QVAE A PETRO DICEBANTUR.

Here the Latin shews the remarkable feature of the accusative absolute instead of the ablative absolute. Now there is some reason to believe this usage to be an Africanism: the Corpus Inscriptionum shews eight cases of the peculiarity amongst the African inscriptions; and I see that Haussleiter in his tract on the Versions of Hermas¹ maintains that this is the most certain of Africanisms: "in certissimis Africae testimoniis numerandam esse puto miram accusativi absoluti pro ablativo absoluto

¹ De versionibus Pastoris Hermae Latinis, p. 44.

positi constructionem; quam, si inscriptionum latinarum volumina adhuc iuris publici facta perlustres, nusquam nisi in titulis Africis animadvertes. Ut legimus in titulo publico c. a. 290 (nr. 8924) (Aurelius Litua), qui...rebelles caesos, multos etiam et vivos adprehensos sed et praedas actas, repressa desperatione corum victoriam reportaverit." Haussleiter is using the point in proof of his thesis of the Africanism of the Palatine Version of Hermas: and if his argument be a correct one, we must apply it to the case which we are discussing: let us see then whether there are any other cases of the kind, excluding of course such as arise from the intrusion or extrusion of a silent final m^4 .

In Acts xx. 12 we find the gloss

achazomenun de aytun salvtantes avte[M] e]os,

which is another case of the same kind.

It may be urged that *salutantes* here is not really an accusative but a nominative, as is shewn by the following line

ADDVXERVNT IVVENEM VIVENTEM,

but we must remember that it has been rendered into Greek from the Latin as a genetive absolute, which is somewhat of a presumption in favour of the opinion that it was meant for an accusative.

In Acts v. 38 we have the curious gloss

MH MIANANTEC ΤΑC χΕΙΡΑC NON COINQVINATAS MANVS.

Here again the Latin text has suspiciously the appearance of an accusative absolute, though the Greek has rendered as if it read *coinquinantes*, which we should certainly have expected. Further, we have in Acts xiv. 19,

MORAS FACIENTES EOS ET DOCENTES

as the equivalent of a Greek genetive absolute.

Here then we have two clear cases, and two doubtful cases, of accusative absolute on the part of the translator or glossator; and this certainly invites the hypothesis that we have definite

¹ e.g. Acts ii. 33, pollicitationem sps sancti accepta.

traces of Africanism. Let us see whether there are any other cases in the rest of the text.

Acts iii. 7 is doubtful

et adpraehensum eum dextera manu suscitabit.

A more likely instance is Acts xvi. 37

anetios caesos nos publice indemnatos homines romanos ciues miserunt in carcerem,

but even this is not perfectly conclusive. It is conceivable that the same idea of the equivalence of the accusative and ablative when used absolutely is responsible for the rendering in Acts xix. 29, where we have

macedonibus comitibus pauli,

as a rendering of

Μακεδόνας συνεκδήμους Παύλου.

But it must be admitted that we have a very decided suggestion of the existence in the Acts of the supposed African accusative absolute, especially in the glosses.

Possibly the Gospels may furnish us with some cases: e.g. there is John xii. 37,

το chaia πε π εποιηκότος το Tanta avtem ab illo signa το Facta,

which looks extremely like the accusative absolute Again, in Matt. xvii. 9,

ET DESCENDENTES DE MONTE PRAECEPIT EIS DICENS ÎHS,

where descendentes is the equivalent of $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \iota \nu \acute{\nu} \nu \tau \acute{\omega} \nu$, but the Greek text has been corrected back from the Latin so as only to shew $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \acute{\nu} \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma^{1}$.

¹ In the nature of the case such forms would rapidly be eliminated; and perhaps we ought to be surprised that there are so many traces of them left. Sometimes we may find the accusative absolute in the very article of death and disappearance. A case may be taken in Acts xiv. 20, where I feel pretty confident that the detached nominative absolute

CIRCVMEVNTES ENIM DISCIPVLI EIVS

is a correction for an accusative. Here, too, the reader will find his Greek text coloured.

We must not, however, put more weight than it will bear on the theory of the Africanism of the accusative absolute. If Haussleiter's criterion is a correct one, it is so for the first centuries of the era. Later on we find cases of it in Merovingian documents, as Diez shews (Gramm. der Rom. Sprächen, III. 267). But most of the cases given by Diez are cases where there is no longer any distinction between accusative and ablative, the m of the accusative not being sonant: e.g. adprehensum unum rusticum de civitate acceptum ab eo pacis praetium, etc. More important are two instances from Bréquigny's Diplomata dated in 543 (illas inspectas), and in 712 (inspectas ipsas praeceptiones): but these seem to be legal formulæ, and so are not perhaps to be judged by grammatical standards. Our position is this, that the Old Latin texts of the New Testament shew primitive traces of the use of the accusative absolute, and that there is reason to believe the early accusative absolute to be African.

It is interesting to observe how near Middleton came to detecting this Latin accusative absolute in Codex Bezae: for he says (Greek Article, p. 480), " $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{o}\nu\tau a$ (in Mark xi. 12) appears to me to be here purposely employed in the sense of a Genitive absolute, and the following passage is similar in a degree which can hardly be imputed to accident: in Luke ix. 37...if $\kappa a\tau\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{o}\nu\tau a\ a\mathring{v}\tau\grave{o}\nu$ do not mean quum descendisset I can make nothing of the place... no critic, I presume, will wish to regard them as examples of the elegant attic accusative absolute."

Let us turn to the other peculiarities which are supposed to characterize the African dialect.

Of these the most striking is the so-called *tumor Africanus*; which consists in the conjunction of a substantive with a synonymous genetive (e.g. avaritiae cupido, feritatis crudelitas, etc.¹).

Let us see whether any of these are found in our texts. We naturally suppose that in a literal translation they will hardly occur; and moreover, if they do occur, the reviser who equalizes the Greek and Latin texts by the law of numerical justice, will probably excise them. But let us, at all events, examine the matter: for we may find traces of the original rendering.

¹ For examples, cf. Sittl, p. 93.

Acts vi. 5,

et non dedit ei possessionem heredetatis in ea,

where the single Greek word κληρονομίαν is rendered by the double expression in Latin. And we may also note the double translation hereditate possidete in Matt. xxv. 34.

It is quite possible that this mannerism is at the root of the perplexing reading in Acts vii. 46, where we have

et petiit tabernaculum inuenire sedes domui iacob.

Here we have a double rendering of $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\omega\mu a$, and the second rendering is itself a double translation and is African, for domui is a genetive formation in the vulgar Latin (e.g. Luke ix. 55, nescitis cuius spiritui estis; Mark iii. 17, quod est filius tonitrui). But if such a rendering had ever stood in the text, it was almost certain to appear in the Greek as $\tau\hat{\varphi}$ oἴκ φ ; and this is actually found (horresco referens!) in **\times**BH as well as in Codex D.

Possibly we might apply the same method to Acts xiii. 15,

ανδρές αδέλφοι ει τις έςτιν λογού coφίας Viri fratres si qvis est sermo et intellectus.

Here the original Greek is certainly $\lambda \acute{o}\gamma os$, without $\sigma o\phi \acute{l}as$; and one of two things has happened; either $\lambda \acute{o}\gamma os$ has been rendered by a double translation sermo et intellectus, which would thus contain the two possible meanings of $\lambda \acute{o}\gamma os$; or else sermo intellectus is a pleonastic translation of $\lambda \acute{o}\gamma os$, which would explain how the genetive $\sigma \acute{o}\phi \acute{l}as$ crept in, if we allow for a subsequent corruption of $\lambda \acute{o}\gamma os$. But the first explanation may seem to many persons the more natural one.

In xix. 9 we have

enwhion toy $\pi\lambda H\theta o\gamma c$ in conspecty multitudinis gentium,

and a subsequent insertion of $\tau\omega N$ equal in the Greek: but here the double genetive may conceivably, though I do not believe it, be nothing more than a conflation of two separate translations.

Acts xx. 19,

Μετά πάςης ταπεινοφροςγνής CVM OMNI HVMILITATI SENSVI, where *sensui* is a genetive, is somewhat more like the African pleonastic usage, but, inasmuch as the two words are not equivalent, and both of them underlie the Greek, it would hardly be fair to call it a case of *tumor Africanus*. But, taking all the cases together, I think we have suggestions of something more than conflation. The same suspicion of African pleonasm is aroused in the text of the Gospels.

An interesting case, but again not a conclusive one, will be found in Mark ii. 5,

MET OPΓHC CYNλΥΠΟΥΜΈΝΟC CVM IRA INDIGNATIONIS,

where a word seems to have dropped after *indignationis*, in which case we should have a double rendering, in true African style, of $\partial \rho \gamma \hat{\eta}_s$.

So in Luke xvi. 24, we have $\tau \hat{\eta} \phi \lambda o \gamma i \tau a \dot{\nu} \tau \eta$ rendered by in ustione ignis hujus.

In Mark vi. 43,

και μραν κλας ματών
 ιΒ·κοφινούς πληρείς
 ET SVSTVLERVNT FRAGMENTORVM
 XII·COFINOS PLENOS.

Here, as we may see by reference to the other Old Latin texts $(a f f f^2 g^1 g^2 i l)$, the original $\kappa \lambda \acute{a} \sigma \mu a \tau a$ was translated by reliquias fragmentorum. Our text erases the first word (as also do b c q) and then changes the Greek of the second.

Other forms of pleonasm are current in African writers, such as the use of a synonymous adjective with a substantive, or of synonymous substantives or adjectives with no conjunction. In examining such cases in the Codex Bezae, the same uncertainty attaches to the matter as we have pointed out above; we are not able without a close study of documents to distinguish a pleonasm from a conflate translation. We shall content ourselves with pointing out a few scattered instances in the Ms., leaving the reader to draw the conclusion.

John xvii. 23,

ΪΝΑ ωCIN ΤΕΤΕλΙωΜΕΝΟΙ
VT SINT PERFECTI CONSVMMATI.

John v. 2,

εΝ ΤΗ προβατική κολγμβήθρα ΙΝ ΝΑΤΑΤΟΡΙΑ ΡΙSCINA,

where a word seems to have been dropped before natatoria. (Cf. Actus Petri cum Simone c. xiii. piscinae adjacenti natatoriae.)

Luke xx. 24,

figuram cuius habet imaginem et superinscriptionem.

Mark x. 18,

nisi solus unus deus,

where the pleonasm has coloured the Greek.

Luke viii. 8,

cecidit super terram bonam et uberam,

which goes back into the Greek as

έπεσεν έπὶ τὴν γῆν καλὴν καὶ ἀγαθήν,

where $\dot{a}\gamma a\theta \dot{\eta}\nu$ is usually said to result from assimilation to the parallel gospels.

In Mark vi. 51 we have an original text $\kappa a \lambda \lambda i a \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} a \nu \tau o \hat{i} \varsigma$ rendered by et plus magis inter se, and the effect of the pleonasm is to throw back an additional $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega} \varsigma$ on the Greek text. In the Bezan text we find only $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega} \varsigma$ extant; in $\aleph BL\Delta$ we have $\lambda i a \nu$ only, which seems to be the original reading, but the Latin texts keep the pleonasm with much constancy (cf. $a f g^1 g^2 i q$ which read plus magis, and e which has magis plus). But perhaps the best proof of the correctness of this theory of pleonastic African renderings with subsequent reflexion on the Greek text, will be to take a case which has hitherto baffled all explanation, and to indicate the progressive degeneration of the Western text.

Few passages have caused me so much perplexity as Luke xiii. 8,

скаψω περι αγτην και Βαλω κοφινον κοπριών

FODIAM CIRCA ILLAM ET MITTAM QVALVM STERCORIS.

The word used by D (qualum) means a wicker-basket, and has C. B.

been changed in the other Western texts into cofinum agreeably to the Greek in Cod. Bezae; thus we find

cofinum stercoris

in $a b c f f l^2 i l$ and q.

Now in such cases, if the Bezan Latin shews a different word from the other Latin codices, it will generally be found that the Bezan word is the older form; but how in the present case are we to explain either of the forms? We suspect, by long experience, that $\kappa \acute{o}\phi \iota \nu o \nu$ in the Greek is merely a reflexion from the Latin, but why should the Western translator render $\kappa \acute{o}\pi \rho \iota a$ by qualum stercoris?

The answer is that he used the pleonastic form

squalem stercoris,

and the word squalem early became corrupted into qualum 1.

Another verification of the theory may be found in the fact that where the primitive Latin rendering is suspected to be pleonastic we find the oldest Latin texts divide on the reading, one half of the reading being preserved in one group of texts and the other half of the reading being preserved in another; so that, while at first sight it seems as if we had two independent translations, a closer examination shews the disjecta membra of a single rendering. A good instance for study will be found in the translations of κληρονομέω, κληρονομία. In Matt. v. 4 we have in d hereditabunt, and in b possidebunt, while the original pleonasm is preserved in a, hereditate possidebunt. Or take the case of Mark x. 22, where an original translation of κτήματα in the sense of 'real and personal estate' appears in the versions as follows: b has multas pecunias et agros; k the nearly equivalent multas divitias et agros; while d only shews multas pecunias, but has in its Greek a reflected χρήματα, which has displaced the original κτήματα.

This bifurcation of the Latin versions is very noticeable with the adverbs and conjunctions² which, as Sittl points out, are often used pleonastically in the African dialect. For example, Sittl quotes

licet et

 $^{^{1}}$ Curiously Tischendorf quotes the Ms. as actually reading $\mathit{squalum},$ but there is no trace of an 's' in the text.

² The simplest case of the kind is perhaps Acts xvii. 23, inveni etiam et aram.

from Tert. De Virg. Vel. § 6 where we have perhaps the remains of a primitive

licet etsi;

and from the African Latin of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Pauline epistles, he quotes

licet si (p. 202, 18),

and

licet si et (p. 197, 12),

which are cases, certainly of pleonasm, and probably of the tautological form

licet etsi.

What shall we say then of Mark vi. 23 which in the Codex Bezae reads

licet dimidium regni mei,

where *licet* is supported also by a i q vg; while, on the other hand, the MSS. b c ff² give

etiamsi,

and g^1 has preserved

licet etsi,

which has a suspicious appearance of being the primitive pleonasm?

Three verses lower down in the same chapter, we find again a curious bifurcation in the testimony, for d, supported by i, reads

et contristatus est rex mox audiit,

but $c ff^2$ replace mox by ut.

The earliest form of the gloss (for it is a gloss, though it has been carried over into the Beza Greek as $\dot{\omega}_{S}$ $\ddot{\eta}\kappa o\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu$) was probably

mox ut audiit,

and in fact the codex g^2 has preserved the double reading 1.

We say, then, that both the Acts and the Gospels arouse suspicions of African pleonasm².

¹ These minute pleonasms meet us at all points in African documents and give rise to much confusion: there is a curious case in the Muratorian Canon, where se publicare vero arises out of a pleonastic sed publicari vero.

² Compare also what has been said above, p. 199, of the double renderings of $\dot{\epsilon}$ κπλήττεσθαι.

In the use of the degrees of comparison Sittl points out many peculiarities in African writers, though he is careful not to commit himself to the theory that the forms are exclusively African.

Such are the intensification of a comparative by magis and plus; the unsymmetrical use of connected adjectives in different degrees of comparison; the use of the genetive of comparison; comparatives constructed with a and ab; the use of comparatives and superlatives in the place of adjectives of the positive degree etc. For my own part, I cannot think that we are yet in a position to speak of such things positively as Africanisms, though they look very like it; yet there are many instances in the Codex Bezae which would fall under one or other of Sittl's classifications.

For example, Matt. xii. 42, plus ionae is a genetive of comparison, taken over from the Greek.

Matt. xii. 45 peiora prioribus shews a comparative where we should expect a positive in a literal translation $(\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \ \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \omega \nu)$.

The same verse shews et generationi huic pessimae, which is a possible African superlative for $\pi o \nu \eta \rho \hat{a}$.

Matt. xxii. 36 gives us quod mandatum in lege maius (μεγάλη). Matt. xiii. 48 collegerunt meliora in vasis.

John xiii. 16 neque apostolus maior eius qui misit eum.

Luke vii. 28 qui minor est eius in regno caelorum.

Matt. xii. 6 quia a templo maior est hic.

The usage of the last case a templo may be the direct result of Punic influence: cf. the Hebrew comparative formed by prefixing the preposition 12.

Two interesting cases of the same kind occur in the Ziegler fragments of the Pauline Epp., viz. 2 Cor. i. 5 nihil minus...ab his qui valde sunt apostoli, and Heb. vii. 26 altiorem a caelis. These Ziegler texts are to be reckoned as African.

Now let us review the course of the argument as regards the origin of the Western text of the Acts.

The text was Montanized at a very early date, and the Montanist glosses shew a decided use of the African accusative absolute. We, therefore, ascribe the Montanization to an African hand.

Of the other glosses we find some which, while not definitely

Montanistic, are suspiciously Carthaginian. For example, there is the case of Peter flying down to the city from the prison. We have also the case of pleonastic translations which are best explained as Africanisms. One of these, viz. the expansion of the Latin and Greek in Acts xiii. 12, is suspected of being a primitive feature of the Latin text. It is possible, then, that we have to describe the Codex Bezae as a Carthaginian text which has been glossed by (mainly) Carthaginian hands. But if this be so, the text must have passed at a very early period in its history to Rome; for it became diffused (with the major part of its glosses) over the whole of the Western world, to say nothing of Upper Egypt and Syria. Moreover there is one passage in the Acts which seems to imply that the Codex Bezae or one of its ancestors actually passed through Rome. I refer to Acts xviii. 2

χωριζεςθαι παντάς ιογδαίογε από της ρώμης discedere omnes ivdaeos ex vrbem.

Now in Carthage ex urbe does not mean the same thing as $\partial\pi\partial$ $\tau\hat{\eta}_S$ 'Póµης. We can see this in a variety of ways. For instance, in the Acts of Perpetua $\partial\pi\partial$ $\tau\hat{\eta}_S$ $\pi\delta\lambda\epsilon\omega_S$ (if any argument can be drawn from the Greek form: for the words are not in the Latin) probably means simply Carthage. Again, if Haussleiter's theory of the African origin of the Palatine version of Hermas be correct, the opening words of the book shew us the rendering of ϵi_S 'Póµην by in urbe Roma. A Roman translator would probably have simply said in urbe. We might also refer to the Muratorian Canon for similar renderings, but this we will not do, because it is not yet agreed whether the original of the Canon was in prose, nor whether its translation into Latin is of Roman or African origin¹.

We suspect, then, that the first translator of the Acts wrote ex urbe Roma; and that Roma was afterwards removed, possibly to balance the Greek and Latin texts, but more likely because the text had itself passed to Rome, where ex urbe was sufficient. Now, if the Montanized recension of the Acts passed to Rome it is clear from the diffusion of the text that it must have passed

¹ Moreover the Muratorian Canon shews both forms: "profectionem Pauli ab urbe," and "temporibus nostris in urbe Roma," "cathedra urbis Romae."

there very early, and have become the official Latin text. And this would seem to require that it was introduced at Rome when Montanism was in the ascendant there. The most likely period for this is the episcopate of Soter or Eleutherus. Tertullian tells us that when Praxeas came to Rome he persuaded the Roman bishop, who favoured the Montanists of Asia, and acknowledged the prophetic gifts of SS. Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla, to recede from that position and recall the letters of peace which he had issued. In this way, says Tertullian, Praxeas "put to flight the Paraclete." This means that, historically, Montanism was at its highest point in Rome under a certain bishop, who is unhappily nameless. It is not an easy matter to determine which Roman bishop is meant. The evidence of the early Church would seem to point to Soter; for Praedestinatus tells us that Soter wrote against the Montanists and that Tertullian wrote against Soter¹. This would place the maximum of Roman Montanism between the dates 160 and 170 A.D. Modern opinion, however, has inclined to see the bishop in question in the successor of Soter, Eleutherus, which would bring us to a slightly later date. The reader will, however, see that we cannot well go farther down in date consistently with the belief in the diffusion of the Montanized copy, which was known to Irenaeus when he wrote his treatise on Heresies, which Harvey places between 182 and 188. It seems to be difficult to place the Montanized Roman edition later than 170 A.D., and it may be a decade earlier. And then behind this glossed edition we have the unglossed (probably) Carthaginian text which must be a number of years earlier. How many years shall we say? Festina lente.

¹ Praedest, Haer, 26 and 86.

CHAPTER XX.

FURTHER ATTEMPTS AT CLASSIFICATION OF THE GLOSSES IN THE WESTERN TEXT OF THE ACTS.

WE will now try to carry the classification of the glosses in the Acts a step further: and by means of the unity of the attestations, the similarity of the doctrinal tendencies, and the parallelisms in the Greek or Latin texts of the glosses, we shall be able to reduce all or nearly all of these glosses to their proper groups.

First we will make a list of the principal glosses accompanied by the chief of the attesting authorities as given by Tischendorf, printing them in Latin where there is some good reason to believe them to have originated in that language, and in Greek when the matter is more doubtful. For convenience of reference we number the glosses successively as they occur in the text:

	Acts		
1	i. 2	et praecepit praedicare evangelium	D lux sah Aug Vig-Taps
2	i. 4	de ore meo	D lux aeth Aug Hil
3	i. 5	et eum accipere habetis	D tol Aug Hil Max-Taur
4	i. 5	usque ad pentecosten	D sah Aug
5	i. 12	τὸ διάστημα ὅσον δυνατὸν Ἰουδαίον	40 aeth
		περιπατείν	
6	ii. 1	καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις	D
7	ii. 33	hoc donum quod	DE tol sah syr ^{soh} syr ^{p,txt}
			ar ^e Iren Did Amb Phi-
			last
8	ii. 37	τότε πάντες οἱ συνελθόντες καὶ	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
9	ii. 37	et quidam ex ipsis	D
10	ii. 37	ostendite nobis	DE tol syr ^{p.mg} Aug
11	ii. 41	et credentes	D syr ^{p.mg} Aug
12	iii. 1	έν δè ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις	D
13	iii. 1	τὸ δειλεινόν	D

	Acts		
14	iii, 3	οὖτος ἀτενίσας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ	D reg
15	iii. 7	stetit et	D reg
16	iii. 11	έκπορευομένου δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου κτέ	D reg
17	iii, 13	in judicium	DE syr ^{p.mg} Iren
18	iii. 17	πονηρόν	D syr ^{p.mg} Iren Aug Am-
		"	brst
19	iii. 22	πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν	DE sah aeth Iren
20	iv. 1	τὰ δήματα ταῦτα	D reg syrsch syrp.mg are
			Thphyl
21	iv. 9	a vobis	DE reg syrutr aethpp are
			Iren Cyp
22	iv. 14	ποιῆσαι ἤ	D reg
23	iv. 18	συγκατατιθεμένων δε αὐτῶν τῆ γνώμη	D reg syr ^{p.mg} Lucif
24	iv. 24	et cognovissent dei virtutem	D
25	iv. 25	per spiritum sanctum	[reading early and attest-
			ation confused]
26	iv. 31	omni volenti credere	DE Iren Aug
27	iv. 32	et non erat accusatio in eis ulla	DE Cyp Ambr Zeno
28	v. 8	έπερωτήσω σε εί ἄρα	DET
29	v. 15	et liberabantur ab omne valetudine	DE Lucif vg
		quem habebat unusquisque eo-	
30	v. 18	rum	D
90	V. 10	et abierunt unusquisque in domi- cilia	D
31	v. 21	exurgentes ante lucem	D
32	v. 22	et aperuissent carcerem	D syr ^p vg
33	v. 35	ad principes et concilium	D sah
34	v. 36	αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ	D
35	v. 38	άδελφοί	D
36	v. 38	non coinquinatas manus	DE
37	v. 39	nec vos nec imperatores nec reges:	DE syr ^p demid
		discedite ergo ab hominibus istis	D syr ^p demid 33 ^{mg} 180
3 8	v. 41	ἀπόστολοι	D syr ^p 180
39	vi. 1	έν τῆ διακονία τῶν έβραίων	D
40	vi. 3	τί οὖν ἔστιν	D
41	vi. 5	τῶν μαθητῶν	D
42	vi. 8	per nomen domini Iesu Christi	DE sah syr ^p 180
43	vi. 10	quae erat in eo	DE
44	vi. 10	sancto	DE vg
45	vi 10	quoniam probatur illis ab Illo cum	$\mathrm{DE}\;\mathrm{syr^{p,mg}}$
4.0		omni fiducia	
46	vi. 10	non potentes autem resistere veri-	DE syr ^{p.mg} bohem
4 100	. 10	tati	70 - 11
47	vi. 13	adversum eum	D aeth

	Acts		
48	vi. 15	έστωτος έν μέσφ αὐτων	D
49	vii. 4	καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν	DE syr ^p Aug
50	vii. 6	πρὸς αὐτόν	D Iren
51	vii. 21	παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν	DE syr ^p
52	vii. 24	καὶ ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῆ ἄμμφ	D aeth
53	vii. 26	τί ποιείτε	D
54	vii. 33	καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτόν	D
55	viii. 1	qui manserunt Hierusalem	D sah Aug
56	viii. 6	ώς δὲ ἦκουον	D syrsch are aeth
57	viii. 19	rogando et	D
58	viii, 24	παρακαλώ	D syr ^p 137 180 Const
59	viii. 24	τούτων τῶν κακῶν	DE
60	viii. 24	δς πολλά κλαίων οὐ διελύμπανεν	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
61	viii. 37	respondens dixit Philippus: si	E vg demid tol arm syr ^p
		credis ex toto corde tuo licet:	Iren Cyp Thphyl
		et respondens spado ait: credo	
		filium dei esse Christum Jesum	
62	ix. 4	σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν	E syr ^{sch} syr ^p ar ^e
63	ix. 5	σκληρόν σοι κτέ	vg tol syr ^p
64	ix. 20	cum omni fiducia	Iren
65	ix. 37	quum autem esset Petrus Lyddae	$\mathrm{syr}^{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{p}}$
66	ix. 40	in nomine domini nostri Jesu	sah syr ^p arm Amb Cyp
		Christi	-
67	x. 25	προσεγγίζοντος δε τοῦ Πέτρου κτέ	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
68	x. 28	melius	D Aug
69	x. 33	παρακαλῶν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς	$\operatorname{D}\operatorname{syr}^{\operatorname{p.mg}}$
70	x. 33	έν τάχει	D
71	xi. 2	διὰ ίκανοῦ χρόνου ήθέλησεν πορευ-	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{s}\mathrm{\mathbf{y}}\mathrm{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathrm{p}}$
F 0		θηναι	D
72	xi: 2	καὶ προσφωνήσαςχάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ	D syr ^p
73	xi. 17	ut non daret eis spiritum sanctum credentibus in eum	D syr ^p bohem Aug
74	xi. 25	ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Σαῦλος κτέ	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
75	xi. 25	erat autem magna exultatio; re-	D Aug
10	Δ1, Δ1	vertentibus autem nobis	D Aug
76	xii. 1	έν τῆ Ἰουδαία	D syr ^p
77	xii. 3	comprehensio ejus	$\mathrm{D} \mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
78	xii. 3	έπὶ τοὺς πιστούς	D syr ^{p.mg}
79	xii. 7	Petro	D sah syr ^p aeth
80	xii, 10	descenderunt septem grados et	D D
		[processerunt] gradum [unum]	
81	xii. 15	forsitam	D syr ^{sch} ar ^e
82	xii. 20	έξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν πόλεων	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p}}$
83	xii. 21	καταλλαγέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Τυρίοις	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p}}$

	A		
0.4	Acts	0) 2) 00/	D
84	xii. 23	καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος	D
85	xii. 23	έτι ζών καὶ οὖτως	D
86	xiii. 8	quoniam libenter audiebat eos	DE syr ^p
87	xiii. 15	[λόγου] καὶ σοφίας	D D D
88	xiii. 19	τῶν ἀλλοφύλων	$\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{D} \; \mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p}} \\ \mathrm{D} \end{array}$
89 90	xiii, 28	κρίναντες αὐτὸν παρέδωκαν	
91	xiii. 41	καὶ ἐσίγησαν	D syr ^p
92	xiii. 44 xiii. 44	έγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης κτέ	DE syr
92	XIII. 44	πολύν τε λόγον ποιησαμένου περὶ τοῦ κυ	D[E]
93	xiii. 45	contradicentes et	DEIP syr ^p Chr
94	xiii. 50	tribulationem magnam	D
95	xiv. 2	οί δὲ ἀρχισυνάγωγοιδικαίων	$D\left[\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}} \right]$
96	xiv. 2	ό δὲ κύριος ἔδωκεν ταχὺ εἰρήνην	DE demid syr ^{p.mg}
97	xiv. 4	adherentes propter verbum dei	D syr ^{p,mg}
98	xiv. 7	[verbum dei.] et commota est	DE
		omnis multitudo in doctrinis. Paulus autem et Barnabas moras faciebant in Lystris	
99	xiv. 9	ύπάρχων ἐν φόβφ	DE
100	xiv. 9	ἀτενίσας δὲ ὁ Παῦλος	DE
101	xiv. 10	σοὶ λέγω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυ ιηυ χυ	CDE sah syr ^{sch} syr ^{p.mg} arm [Iren]
102	xiv. 19	moras facientes eos et docentes	CDE syr ^{p.mg} arm are etc.
103	xiv. 25	evangelizantes eos	D syr ^p
104	xiv. 27	μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν	D
105	xv. 1	καὶ περιπατήτε	D sah syr ^{p.mg}
106	xv. 2	έλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλοςἀπὸ Ἰερου- σαλήμ	D syr ^{p,mg}
107	xv. 2	οπως κριθώσιν έπ' αὐτοῖς	D syr ^p 137
108	xv. 4	καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν	HL etc. Thphyl
109	xv. 5	πίστεως	D cymp.ms
109	AV. O	οί δὲ παραγγείλαντεςτοὺς πρεσ- βυτέρους	D syr ^{p,mg}
110	xv. 7	έ ν πνεύματι	D syr ^{p.mg} 137
111	xv. 11	συγκατατεθεμένων δε τών πρεσβυτέ- ρων τοις ύπο του Πέτρου είρημένοις	D syr ^p
112	xv. 13	surgens	D syr ^{sch}
113	xv. 20	καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσινμὴ ποιείτε	D sah aeth Iren
114	xv. 23	έπιστολην περιέχουσαν τάδε	CD sah aeth syr ^{p,mg}
115	xv. 26	είς πάντα πειρασμόν	DE syr ^{p.mg} 137
116	xv. 29	καὶ ὄσα μὴ θέλετε κτέ	D sah syr ^p aeth Iren Cyp
117	xv. 29	ferentes in sancto spiritu	D Iren Tert
118	xv. 30	ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις	D

	A		
770	Acts		T)
119	xv. 32	pleni spiritu sancto	D
120	xv. 34	έδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλα ἐπιμείναι αὐτοῦ	CD sah aeth cop syr
121	xv. 34	μόνος δε Ἰούδας επορεύθη	D tol arm
122	xv. 38	είς ο επεμφθησαν, τουτον μη είναι συν αυτοις	D tol
123	xv. 41	παραδίδους τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν πρεσβυ- τέρων	D tol syr ^{p,mg}
124	xvi. 1	διελθών δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ταῦτα	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
125	xvi. 4	cum omni fiducia dominum Jesum Christum simul tradentes et	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
126	xvi. 9	κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ	$D \operatorname{syr}^p$
127	xvi. 10	exurgens ergo enarrabit visum nobis et intellegimus quoniam provocavit nos dominus	D sah
128	xvi. 11	τῆ δὲ ἐπαύριον	D syr ^{p,mg} 137
129	xvi. 16	per hoc	D
130	xvi. 19	ης είχαν δι' αὐτης	D
131	xvi. 22	κράζουτες	D
132	xvi. 30	τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφαλισάμενος	$D \operatorname{syr}^p$
133	xvi. 35	συνηλθον οί στρατηγοί έπι τὸ αὐτὸ	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
		είς την άγοράν, και άναμνησθέντες	
		τὸν σεισμὸν τὸν γεγονότα ἐφοβή- θησαν	
134	xvi. 35	οΰς έχθὲς παρέλαβες	D syr ^p 137
135	xvi. 39	παραγενόμενοι μετὰ φίλων πολλών	D
136	xvi. 39	ηγνοήσαμεν τὰ καθ' ύμᾶς ὅτι ἐστὲ	D syr ^p 137
		ἄνδρες δίκαιοι κτέ	
137	xvi. 40	ιδόντες τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς διηγήσαντο ὅσα κτέ	D
138	xvii. 6	et dicentes	D
139	xvii. 12	quidam vero credere noluerunt	D 137
140	xvii. 12	et viri et mulieres pleres credide-	D
		runt	
141	xvii. 13	οὖ διελίμπανον	D syr ^{sch} ar ^e
142	xvii. 15	παρηλθεν δε την Θεσσαλίαν εκωλύθη γαρ είς αὐτοὺς κηρύξαι τον λόγον	D
143	xvii. 19	cogitantes et	D syr ^p 137
144	xviii. 2	οἳ καὶ κατώκησαν εἰς τὴν ᾿Αχαΐαν	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
145	xviii. 4	et interponens nomen domini Jesu	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
146	xviii. 6	πολλοῦ δὲ λόγου γεινομένου καὶ γρα-	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{p,\mathrm{mg}}$
		φῶν διερμηνευομένων	
147	xviii. 8	per nomen dni nostri ihu xpi	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}\;137$
148	xviii. 11	έν Κορίνθω	D syr ^{sch} syr ^p ar ^e aeth
149	xviii. 12	συνλαλήσαντες μεθ' έαυτῶν	D
150	xviii. 12	καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας	$D \text{ sah syr}^p$

	A come		
151	ACTS xviii. 13	clamantes et	D
151	xviii. 19		D sah syr ^{p.mg} 137
153	xviii. 19	καὶ τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ	D san syr 137
		έν τῆ πατρίδι	D syr ^{p,mg}
154	xviii. 26	έν δὲ τῆ Ἐφέσωσυνκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ	D syr
155	xviii. 27	έν Κορίνθω	D syr ^{p.mg}
156	xviii. 27	οπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα	D syr ^{p.mg}
157	xviii. 27	εὶς τὴν ᾿Αχαΐαν	D
158	xviii. 28	διαλεγόμενος καὶ	D 137
159	xix. 1	volente vero Pauloreverti in Asiam	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\scriptscriptstyle\mathrm{p.mg}}$
160	xix. 2	[neque spiritum sanctum] acci-	D
		piunt quidam [audivimus]	
161	xix. 5	είς ἄφεσιν άμαρτιῶν	$D \operatorname{syr}^p$
162	xix. 6	έτέραις	D sah syr ^{p.mg}
163	xix. 6	et sentiebant in seipsis quod et	$\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
		interpretabantur illis hi ipsi:	
		quidam autem [prophetabant]	
164	xix. 8	cum fiducia magna	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
165	xix. 9	τινὸς ἀπὸ ώρας ε΄ εως δεκάτης	$\mathrm{D}\ 137\ \mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
166	xix. 14	et introieruntcoeperunt invocare nomen	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
167	xix. 14	praecipimustibi[per]Jesu[m]quem	D syr ^{p,mg}
	(repeated	Paulus praedicat	· ·
	from v. 13)		
168	xix. 20	et fides dei convalescebat	D
169	xix, 25	συντεχνίται	D sah syr ^p
170	xix. 28	δραμόντες είς τὸ ἄμφοδον	D syr ^{p,mg} 137
171	xx. 3	εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p,mg}}$
172	xx. 12	ἀσπαζομένων δὲ αὐτῶν	D
173	xx. 18	ώς τριετίαν η καὶ πλεῖον	D
174	xx. 24	τοῦ λόγου	D tol Lucif Amb
175	xx. 24	'Ιουδαίοις καὶ "Ελλησιν	D sah Lucif
176	xxi. 1	καὶ Μύρα	D sah
177	xxi. 5	sequenti autem die ambulavimus viam nostram	D
178	xxi. 16	et cum venerunt in quendam civi- tatem fuimus	$\mathrm{D}\;\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p,mg}}$
179	xxii. 28	quam facile civem Romanum te	bohem Beda
180	xxiii. 9	quid est in hoc	syrach are
181	xxiii. 24	έφοβήθη γὰρ μήποτε άρπάσαντες	syr ^p 137
		αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτενῶσι καὶ	
		αὐτὸς μεταξὺ ἔγκλημα ἔχη ώς ἀρ-	
		γύριον είληφώς	
		1 1	

	Acts		
182	xxiv. 10	defensionem habere pro se: statum autem assumens divinum dixit ex multis annis es judex	$\mathrm{S}\mathrm{yr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$
183	xxiv. 27	τὸν δὲ Παῦλον εἴασεν ἐν τηρήσει διὰ	$\mathrm{syr}^{\mathrm{p.mg}}$ 137
•		Δρουσίλλαν	
184	xxv. 3	illi qui votum fecerant quomodo	$\operatorname{syr}^{\operatorname{p.mg}}$
		obtinerentut in manibus suis	
		esset	
185	xxv. 25	et hic ut traderem etc. etc.	syr ^{p.mg} bohem
186	xxvii. 15	flanti (l. flatui) et collegimus	syr ^p 137 c ^{scr} Beda
		artemonem	
187	xxvii. 41	eo ubi syrtis	syr^p
188	xxviii. 30	'Ιουδαίους τε καὶ Έλληνας	tol syr ^p 137 e ^{scr}
189	xxviii. 31	quoniam hic est Christus	syr ^p demid tol bohem
190	xxviii. 31	per quem incipiet totus mundus	syr ^p demid tol
		judicari	

Here then are 190 selected glosses from the Acts, of which probably none will find a defender; so that they are not really various readings at all, but portions of commentary.

Let us now see whether and how far these are reducible to distinct hands, in the manner which has been pointed out previously. We quote the glosses by the numbers prefixed to them, and group them by their peculiarities in doctrine, language, and attestation, the classification being less certain where the number is placed within brackets. For convenience we will attach to the separate glossators a Greek letter.

- a. The following glosses are Montanistic.
- (a) Doctrine of the Reception of the Paraclete emphasized, and other allusions to the influence of the Spirit, as Energy, Sophia &c.:

3. 4. [7] 24. [25] 43. 44. 45. 73. 110. 117. 119. 159. 160. 171

(b) Doctrine of prophecy and of the reception of prophetic gifts:

75. 119. 163

(c) Doctrine of the power of the sacred Name:

42. 66. 101. 145. 147. [166]

(d) Visions and their manner of interpretation:

127

(e) Doctrine of παρρησία:

37. 45. 64. 125. [164]

Probably gloss 37 carries with it the previous gloss 36.

(f) Sharp distinction between believers and unbelievers, and necessity for faith with baptism:

9. 11. 26. 61. 139. 140. [168]

(g) Contempt for runaways:

122

(h) Glosses to emphasize the fact that the Apostles preached the Gospel, to wit, the Word of the Lord and the Person of the Lord:

1. 92. 97. 98. 125

(i) Glosses to get rid of the bareness and unspirituality of the decree of the Council at Jerusalem;

113. 116. 117

(k) Similarity of attestation brings together such passages as

1. [2] 3.

 β . The following gloss belongs to the person whom I distinguish as the Homerizer:

80

 γ . The following are probably due to double translations, pleonasms, &c. of the first translator:

10. 15. 17. [35] 47. 50. [51] 57. 58. 59. 69. 70. [76] 79. 81. 87. 93. 94. 105. 112. 129. [130] 131. 138. 143. 148. 151. 156. 162

The following pairs of glosses fall together, from the coincidences in language:

- δ. 60 and 141 (διαλιμπάνω).
- ϵ . 72 and 92 (multum verbum faciens).
- 5. The following are likely to be by the same hand, since they involve obscure assimilations to the text of the Gospels:

30 (which carries 31 with it). 86. 98

 ζ . The two following glosses, which speak of the believers as the just men, probably go together:

95. 136

 η . The following involve textual repetitions in the Latin, made necessary in most cases by the interpolation of glosses, and giving rise to two types of Greek:

37. 46. [98] 167

- θ . Glosses of the nature of lectionary prefaces, or reader's expansions and connections:
 - 6. [8] 12. 16. 65. [71] 118. 124. 128. [146] 148. 155 and perhaps others.
- ι. A group of bold and startling expansions of the narrative, the major part of which certainly proceeded from a common hand:

[32] [33] [59] 60. 74. [82] 83. 84. 85. 96. 106. 109. [120] [121] 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 142. 144. 154. [155] 156. 157. 158. [159] 165. 170. 177. 178. 179. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185

The remainder of the glosses are difficult to classify.

Now let us see whether these ten imagined glossators, whom we have selected from the conceivable 190 hands in the text, can be connected with one another.

If we turn to the group of glosses in Acts vi. 10, we have a natural feeling that they all belong to the same hand, for they occur at the same place, and have a common tendency: it seems reasonable to believe therefore that gloss 46 which is a mere repetition in the Latin belongs with 43, 44, 45 which rendered it necessary. This makes the glossator η the same as α .

Again a comparison of glosses 97 and 98 shews the common connecting term "the word of God": it is likely then that these are by the same hand; for they are nearly adjacent in the text, and have a common idea. Hence we have placed 97 and 98 under $\alpha(h)$: but η also contains 98 (on suspicion); and this agrees with what has just been deduced that η and α are the same hand.

But 98 also turns up in σ on the ground of its imitation of a sentence in the Gospels.

It may, therefore, be said tentatively that $\alpha s \eta$ are one and the same.

The identity of η with α would seem to follow also from the fact that it contains the gloss 37, which is one of the very decided cases of the $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma' a$ which so often occurs in our text.

Let us say, then, tentatively that the groups of glosses are not all independent; but that the most important of them are the translator (γ) , the Montanist $(\alpha + \sigma + \eta)$, the Homerizer (β) , a scribe who has lectionary usage in his mind (θ) , and a daring commentator (ι) .

We credit the Montanist now with the glosses

1, [2] 3, 4, [7] 9, 11, 24, [25] 26, 30, 31, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 61, 64, 66, 72, 73, 75, 86, 92, 95, 97, 98, 101, 110, [111] 113, 116, 117, 119, 122, 125, 127, 136, 139, 140, 145, 147, 159, 160, 163, [164] [166] 167, [168] 171, [172]

Now let us see how the attestation of these errors is grouped: we have traces of the Montanizer in

CDE 137 lux tol reg demid sah aeth syr^{sch} ar^e syr^{p,txt} syr^{p,mg} bohem Iren Tert Cyp Aug Vig-Taps Hil Did Amb Philastr Max-Taur.

Now the doubtful members in this very Western group are Codex C and the Peshito Syriac with its daughter the Arabic. It is hard to believe in the dependence of their text on the Montanized text when they occur so rarely in support of special readings.

The examination shews that Codex C only attests the gloss 101, and syr^{sch} the two glosses 7, 101, and the Arabic the gloss 7. It would seem then that these two glosses are wrongly included in the body of the Montanist readings. We therefore detach them, and assign them provisionally to some earlier date.

This allows us to make the provisional statement that the Western elements in Cod. C, and the primitive Syriac translation, are earlier than the Western Montanist glosses.

But we can, upon this hypothesis, make the chronological landmarks more conspicuous. For we know that gloss 80 antedates the Syriac translation which took up and transmitted the $\nu\dot{\nu}\xi as$ of the Homerizer: we say then that the chronological order (since the Homerizer is certainly a Latin) is

> Latin translation, Homeric gloss, Primitive Syriac.

Now let us turn for a moment to the glosses which are attested by Cod. C. We find that they are five in number, viz. 101, 102, 108, 114, 120. And it is possible that these Western elements of Cod. C are antecedent to the Latin rendering, though they belong to the Western text, geographically speaking. They shew no decided traces of Latinism, for the gloss 102, which is the most likely to be primitive Latin, may very likely be a part of the first translation, and have been found in the translator's Greek.

We say then, still in a tentative manner, that the probable order in time is

Western glosses of Cod. C, Latin translation, Homeric gloss, Primitive Syriac, Montanist glosses.

Now the Sahidic glosses have been shewn to contain a large proportion of the Montanist element: we recognize the Sahidic and its companion the Ethiopic in such a group as

1. [2] 42, 66, 113, 116, 127.

There is no mistaking the significance of this evidence: we cannot easily evade the conclusion that the Sahidic text is later in date than the body of the Montanist glosses. We, therefore, add the Sahidic to the previous list, so as to give

Western glosses of Cod. C, Latin translation, Homeric gloss, Primitive Syriac, Montanist glosses, Sahidic version.

It will be remembered that we assign the Montanizer roughly to the date 160 A.D., or a little later. The original Latin rendering must evidently be many years earlier; indeed we suspect that it must have been in existence in the early part of the second century. But the reader will have seen that we have not pretended that our investigation is complete, or that our conclusions are final. We are throwing lines across chasms which we hope to bridge by-and-bye.

CHAPTER XXI.

LOCAL AND TEMPORAL ORIGIN OF THE PRIMITIVE WESTERN TEXT OF THE GOSPELS.

When we pass to the text of the Gospels, we are discussing very much the same problem as the preceding; for the probability is very high that the translation of the Acts of the Apostles is only a sequel and complement to the rendering of the Gospels into the vulgar tongue. The translation of the Gospels might be perhaps the earlier work, but that is all the difference. Hence there is a presumption that if the Acts of the Apostles in its Latin dress passed from Carthage to Rome, the Gospels had preceded it; or if Rome was the place of publication for the one, it was probably so for the other. We can, if we wish, leave the exact direction of motion of the primitive copy an open question, until a definite conclusion forces itself upon us.

But in approaching the subject on its own merits, apart from such suggestions as have been presented in the previous enquiry, we have a harder problem in some respects in the case of the Gospels than in that of the Acts. For, although there are numerous glosses in the Gospels, they do not shew the same unity of design, nor the same definiteness as to the time and place of production, as do the Montanist glosses in the Acts. There is, indeed, one striking Western reading which is perhaps Montanistic; I mean that beautiful variation of the Lord's prayer which replaced the two clauses

άγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ή βασιλεία σου·

by the single sentence

έλθέτω τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς. Now this variation, which in the form we have given is taken from Gregory of Nyssa (De Orat. Dom. § 3), was known both to Tertullian and to the ancestry of Codex Bezae¹. The former appears by a reference to Tertullian's treatise against Marcion (IV. 26) where, in discussing the successive clauses in the Lord's prayer (and we see no reason to assume that it was Marcion's text rather than his own), he proceeds in the following order "Cui dicam, pater?...A quo spiritum sanctum postulem?...Eius regnum optabo venire, quem numquam regem gloriae audivi?... Quis dabit mihi panem quotidianum...?" Here Tertullian has certainly explained the second clause of the Lord's prayer in harmony with the peculiar form preserved by Gregory of Nyssa. And, as I think Dr Sanday pointed out, there are signs in the text of Cod. Bezae that something of the same kind once stood here: for we have in Luke xi. 2

agiacθhtω onoma coy εφ hmac sanctificetvr nomen tvvm svper nos,

(The article is omitted, as commonly in D, being unbalanced in the Latin.) We may then, I think, say we have here either a Montanistic or a Marcionite gloss: the former, if it belongs to the text immediately antecedent to the Tertullian text: the latter, if it can be pushed back to an earlier period. Beyond this somewhat obscure instance, I do not know of any definite Montanistic touches in the Gospels. So that the argument will not at first statement move pari passu with the case of the Acts: perhaps because the Gospels were well fixed in Latin before Montanus. We can however proceed in another way.

We may affirm that the earliest Western readings of which we have any historical knowledge are exactly like the rest of the Bezan readings in that they have a suspicion of Latinizing attaching to them. For example, what are we to say of the famous dispute in regard to the reading of Matt. xi. 27 (οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα), which was such a favourite passage from the Gnostic standpoint, and of such antiquity that we can trace it onwards from Justin and Marcion to Irenaeus and Clement and Origen?

¹ It actually occurs in Mr Hoskier's Codex (Ev. 604). A full discussion of this variant will be found in Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, pp. 25—27.

Does it not look very much as if some one had harmonized the Latin 'novit' (which was a right translation of the Greek γινώσκει οτ ἐπιγινώσκει) with its bilingual conjugate by means of a new translation? We have had cases enough of this kind to make us speak very confidently on such a point. Nor is there any difficulty in the supposition, for Justin and Marcion are both Roman teachers, and Alexandrian texts can be shewn to inherit directly the earlier peculiarities of the Western bilingual. In dealing then with Western readings we suspect Latinization from the earliest periods of textual history. That is the first position we take.

In the next place we have learnt from our study of the growth of the Western text of the Acts to distrust entirely the assumption that there are no such things as heretical and factional depravations of the text. As far as we are able to judge, one half of the Roman world Montanized its Acts of the Apostles, and the readings thus produced are found from the banks of the Tyne to beyond the Cataracts of the Nile. Hence we find it difficult to believe that Dr Hort can be right when he says1 that it is his distinct belief "that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes." The statement seems too strong; and while we are willing to admit that the transcription of the New Testament in its successive stages has been accomplished, in the main, with excellent intentions, there are certainly places where a foreign and factional hand can be detected. Surely it is a curious thing that the Latin of Codex Bezae shews the reading in Luke xviii. 19

nemo bonus nisi unus ds pater².

Has that added word at the end of the sentence no meaning in the controversies of the second century? And if it has any

¹ Introduction, p. 282.

² From the Marcionite standpoint, Christ was not to be spoken of as either good or bad, but as occupying a middle position: hence Hippolytus sums up the teaching in the words χωρίς γενέσεως έτει πεντεκαιδεκάτω τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος κατεληλυθότα αὐτὸν ἄνωθεν, μέσον ὅντα κακοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ, διδάσκεω ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς. Philos. VII. 31.

meaning, is it not a dogmatic alteration? Is it not Marcionite in appearance? Does it not occur in the very Gospel of which Marcion gave a new recension, and in view of this is it a mere error that Epiphanius assigns the reading to the authorship of Marcion? Must not the reading go back in date to the days of Marcion, when we find that Irenaeus attacks the Gallican Gnostics for their use of the passage?

Or take another instance; it is the fashion to print Matt. xix. 17 in the form

τί με έρωτᾶς περί τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ;

a text of which we should certainly say à priori that it was a Gnostic depravation. Most assuredly this is a Western reading, for it is given by D a b c e $ff^{1\cdot 2}$ g^1 h l and the vulgate, a striking piece of unanimity. Further we notice that D, as its custom is, has erased the unbalanced article $\tau o\hat{v}$; and it is interesting to observe that of the three cursives which Tischendorf cites in support of the text (1. 22. 251) one has this same peculiarity of dropping the article, while the allusion which Origen makes to the passage shews the very same omission ($\hat{\omega}_S \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\iota} d\gamma a \theta o \hat{v} \epsilon \rho \gamma o v \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \eta - \theta \epsilon \nu \tau o_S$). Surely these facts are significant enough to make one believe that the texts in question derive the passage from the Western bilingual.

But it will be said that we have also to deal with **\circs**BL and certain versions. Well! According to Westcott and Hort **\circs** and B were both written in the West, probably at Rome. Did Roman texts never influence one another¹? But we will simply say in a tentative manner, that if the clause in question be not genuine, it would go far towards proving that the Roman Gospels did not escape altogether from Gnostic glosses in the second century. The advantage of this position is that we may find a series of chronological landmarks by means of which to set in order the different stages of the Greek and Latin texts and the various versions.

One of the best things to attempt, then, is to test the Western

¹ We will admit that the subject demands a more careful consideration, and we remember that it has not really been proved that the two great Uncials are Roman in origin. Their history remains to be written.

text generally for Marcionism, and we cannot take a better example than Luke xxiii. 2

τοῦτον εὖρον διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ήμῶν, καὶ κωλύοντα φόρους διδόναι Καίσαρι.

Here was a tempting passage for those whose anti-Judaic theology had brought them to the necessity of altering all those places where the Gospel of Luke had spoken approvingly of either the Jewish nation, the Jewish law, or the Jewish prophets. Christ himself was accused of hostility to the race! So, without stopping to enquire whether Christ was rightly or wrongly charged with antagonism to the Jews, a Marcionite or Gnostic hand added to the accusation words which Epiphanius gives in the form

καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας1.

(It was quite natural for a Marcionite to make this addition, for the same sect altered Luke xvi. 17 so as to read

εὐκοπώτερον δέ ἐστιν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν, ὡς καὶ ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἢ τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν.)

By this means the Marcionite placed himself by the side of the Saviour at the moment of his trial; it was as if he said $E\gamma\dot{\omega}$ $\epsilon i\mu \chi \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{\nu}$. And so successful was the interpolation, and so widely was the Roman Church Marcionized in the middle of the second century, that the reading is found, not indeed in Cod. Bezae, but in

$b c e ff^2 i l q$ etc.

Its Greek attestation is zero, except for the passage in Epiphanius: yet we need not doubt that it stood in the ancient Roman bilinguals.

But this is not all; the process of interpolation was carried still further. The Marcionites having made an ally of Christ, as against the reproaches of the orthodox, inserted a second gloss, by means of which another arrow of the orthodox hunter was diverted to the Founder of the Faith. There is a mysterious gloss at the same part of the text which we have quoted above, which has

¹ Epiph. c. Marc. 316. Cf. Iren. i. xxvii. 2 (= Mass. 106), Marcion dicit..."Iesum ...in hominis forma manifestatum his qui in Iudaea erant, dissolventem prophetas et legem et omnia opera eius Dei qui mundum fecit."

almost disappeared from current texts. It appears in Epiphanius in connection with the previous gloss, for Epiphanius says that Marcion also added the words,

καὶ ἀποστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα,

at the close of the passage which we have quoted above. And when we turn to the Old Latin texts, we actually find the words in question, in a longer and more significant form, at the end of v. 5. Here Codd. ce give us

et filios nostros et uxores avertit a nobis; non enim baptizantur sicut et nos, nec se mundant.

Now what does this mysterious passage mean? Why should Christ be charged (absurd anachronism!) with erroneous forms of baptism, and with misleading women and children? The answer is that these are heads of the indictment against Marcion and his followers, who do not hold to the perfunctory method of baptism, but demand a severe ascetic preparation for the rite. Let us hear what Tertullian says on the matter:

(adv. Marc. 1. 29): "Non tinguitur apud illum caro nisi virgo, nisi vidua, nisi coelebs, nisi divortio baptisma mercata, quasi non etiam spadonibus ex nuptiis nata," and again (adv. Marc. IV. 11): "nuptias non conjungit, conjunctas non admittit, neminem tingit, nisi caelibem aut spadonem, morti aut repudio baptisma servat."

These passages will, I think, shew conclusively what is meant by the curious gloss in c e concerning the alienation of wives and the refusal of baptism. We see, then, two stages of Latin Marcionite corruption in this passage. And although Cod. D has escaped, it is probably only by means of the grace of repentance; such an attestation as we find above must surely have involved the original of the Bezan text. It is sufficiently shewn then that the glosses are demonstrably of a Marcionite character.

And now we begin to stand on firmer ground, for the problem has again become similar to that which we worked out for the Acts; and the hypothesis is invited that the primitive Western bilingual is earlier than the days of Marcion and shews traces of having passed through a process of Marcionization. On this hypothesis we shall expect to find traces of Western textual disturbance in

the neighbourhood of those places where Tertullian and Epiphanius accuse Marcion of adulterating the records.

For instance, we are told that Marcion tampered with the text of Luke iv. 16, where Christ comes into the synagogue of His native place and reads from the prophets. We do not exactly know how far the knife of the reviser cut at this point; but we do know that he never called Christ a man of Nazareth, if he could help it, for fear of fulfilling a prophecy; and that, according to his theory and Gospel, Christ had appeared suddenly from heaven ("de caelo in synagogam"). It is generally reckoned, therefore, that Marcion omitted the words

οδ ην τεθραμμένος,

and

κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ.

Now let us see whether these Marcionite omissions have left any mark on the Western Latin text. First take Cod. e, and we find that the words $\kappa \alpha \tau \hat{\alpha} \ \tau \hat{o} \ \epsilon l \omega \theta \hat{o} \hat{o} \ a \hat{\nu} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ are omitted! Then turn to Codex Bezae and examine, first its Greek, and then its Latin:

elhwn De eic nazaped ottoy hn kata to eiwhoc en th hmepa twn cabbatwn eic thn cynarwfhn.

Note the omission of $\tau\epsilon\theta\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{e}\nu\sigma$ and of $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\mathring{\varphi}$ after $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\omega\theta\dot{\sigma}$, and it will be seen that the text has undergone Marcionite revision. The Lord was not reared in Nazareth, nor is it his custom to visit the Nazarene synagogue, but only there is a custom of visiting the synagogue generally: then turn to the Latin

VENIENS AVTEM IN NAZARED VBI ERAT NVTRICATVS INTROIBIT • SECVNDVM CONSVETVDINEM IN SABBATO • IN SYNAGOGAM,

and notice how the colometry, as marked by the inserted points, has been deranged by the restoration of the missing words. Is it not curious that the confusion should occur at the very point where Marcion's history opens?

Why is it that, again, when we find Marcion in his book of Contradictions maintaining that the God of the Old Testament who sent down fire from heaven at the request of Elias could not be the good God who sent his Son (for Christ refused to bring down fire from heaven at the request of his disciples), that the text of Luke ix. 54, 55, where the latter story is told, has such significant glosses? First we are told by a large company of uncial texts and Western authorities to add the words

ώς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν,

which was just the gloss for a Marcionite exegete to have made, since it kept before the reader's mind one of the main points of the system of Marcion.

Then we find the added sentence

KAI EITTEN OYK OIDATE TOIOY THEYMATOC ECTE ${\it ET\ DIXIT}$ Nescitis cvivs spiritvi 1 estis.

Dr Hort says that both these passages are Western; we add that if so they are probably Marcionite, and that the meaning of the latter passage is that the disciples were acting as though they belonged to the Just God rather than to the Good God.

We should say then that Western copies of the Gospels suffered from deliberate Marcionization. But let us take a more simple instance of textual variation, where no dogmatic tendency is involved.

Marcion is charged with having removed the word αἰώνιον from Luke x. 25.

The Bezan text is

ΤΙ ΠΟΙΗCAC ΖωΗΝ ΔΙωΝΙΟΝ ΚΆΗΡΟΝΟΜΗCω QVID FACIENS VITAM ΔΕΤΈΓΝΑΜ HEREDITABO.

Here there is no sign of any erasure having taken place. But it is extremely likely that such did occur in certain Old Latin texts². We remember the fondness of the old translation for rendering $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\rho\nu\rho\mu\acute{e}\omega$, $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\rho\nu\rho\mu\acute{e}\omega$, $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\rho\nu\rho\mu\acute{e}\omega$ by two words possidere, hereditare: and on turning to the other Old Latin texts as for instance a b, we find 'possidebo' in place of 'hereditabo.' Does it not look as if the primitive bilingual had used both words? But if it did, 'aeternam' was very likely to have been ousted in the interests of numerical equivalence. We think it probable, then, that the same

¹ Spiritui is a genetive.

² The word aeternam is in fact missing in Cod. g^2 .

mode of reasoning, which we applied to the Montanist glosses in the Acts, applies also to cases of real or reputed Marcionization in the text of the Gospels, and especially of the Gospel of Luke. That is to say, the corruptions are Latinizations, and we believe the primitive translation lies behind Marcion and behind Justin.

The case of Marcion can hardly be distinguished textually, either as to time or locality, from that of Tatian. Now the text of Tatian has been known, for a long while, to be phenomenally Western. We do not believe that these Western readings arose either in Syria or in Asia Minor. Our opinion is that they are Roman and belong to bilingual texts of an early period. The subject demands a special treatment, but there is surely nothing incredible in the supposition. We know that Tatian studied and taught in Rome, and it is therefore reasonable to find him using Roman texts. Much of our perplexity has been cleared away by realizing the textually metropolitan character of the Eternal City. Much more has disappeared by tracing the effect of undoubtedly Latin texts on Egyptian copies and versions. If Rome furnished texts to Alexandria and Upper Egypt, there is not the slightest difficulty in her ministering to the needs of Edessa, especially when a great teacher from that part of the world was discipling and being discipled in the City.

Closely connected with this question is that of the origin of the Curetonian Syriac, which furnishes another landmark for the textual variations. This subject also has to be investigated afresh: we are prepared to believe that the Curetonian text is a translation from a Western bilingual. But whether it is older than Tatian or younger is a point which must be carefully re-examined. On these questions, then, we may reserve our judgments, for it is probable that the life-histories of one or two other codices may have to be written before we can reach a definite conclusion. In the meanwhile we need not hesitate to affirm that every consideration that we know of indicates the antiquity of the Latin Gospels: and, whether they were rendered into the vulgar tongue in Carthage or Rome, their date is far earlier than one would suspect from the language of modern writers, who usually content themselves with saying that the Old Latin was made before the time of Tertullian.

CHAPTER XXII.

FURTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM.

Our next step must be to deal with the actual glosses in the Bezan text of the Gospels, in order that we may determine whether they can be classified, and to what periods in the history of the Church they ought to be referred. And we must try to find out in what order the various renderings of the Greek Gospels into other tongues occurred, the problem involving one more term for the Gospels than for the Acts, on account of the existence of the Tatian Harmony in Syriac. It is, however, rendered more simple by the fact that Tatian's name is itself a chronological landmark; and, if we only knew the primitive form of his work a little better, we should rapidly arrive at important conclusions, for we should have identified a body of Western readings that were necessarily anterior to a given date. It is unfortunate, then, that so much is still obscure with regard to the details of the primitive Harmony. Nevertheless, in spite of all difficulties and of our imperfect data, we feel sure that the problem is a soluble one.

But in conducting the investigation we must be prepared for surprises. In the field of New Testament Criticism the unexpected is always happening: hypotheses which have been reckoned outworn reappear, and popular and attractive modern theories have frequently to be discarded. One needs a new conscience in the matter of Church History, and a quickened conscience in the matter of palaeography, and the general history of literary transmission. The foregoing pages will have furnished sufficient instances of what we mean. Who would have supposed from the study of Ecclesiastical History, as usually read and

written, that the Montanist movement and the Marcionite movement which preceded it had so completely swept over the Western Church? We are accustomed, on the contrary, to regard the Roman Church as strained clear of every heresy, as if the successive heresies were a series of gnats which had settled accidentally in the "new wine's foaming flow," and which had merely to be removed by the deft hand of some Defender of the Faith. But Justin would have taught us differently if we had read him aright, for he tells us that Marcion's teaching was diffused amongst every race of men1. Tertullian, too, shews what the force of the first Marcionite teaching must have been by his comparison of the later heretics, in his day expelled from the Catholic Church, to swarms of wasps building combs in imitation of the bees2. Nor are there wanting other intimations, both literary and epigraphic, of the scope of the movement. When we understand this rightly, we are not so much surprised, as we should otherwise have been, at finding Marcionite readings in the Western text of the New Testament.

Again, as we have intimated above, we may have to allow for some unknown terms in palaeography. It has often been tacitly assumed that the earliest MSS. of the New Testament were faithful representations of the primitive script down to the minutest traces of punctuation and of abbreviation. We have, however, taken pains to shew that all things did not remain unchanged from the first century down to the time of production of the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices. And in particular we can give reasons for believing that the primitive abbreviations were quite different to what we find in the extant Codices; and that the text has in very early times been affected by false reductions and misunderstandings of these abbreviations.

So, also, with regard to the literary influences of the time. At first sight it seems strange that we should affirm that Homeric and metrical glosses crept into Western texts. But this difficulty simply arises from not realizing what a scholarly education was like in the first centuries of the Christian era. Homer was the Bible of the expiring faith, and the staple of pagan education.

¹ Apol. 1. 26 κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων.

² "Faciunt favos et vespae: faciunt ecclesias et Marcionitae."

It was no more strange that a scribe should gloss from Homer than that a modern writer should give a New Testament turn to his speech. The reader will find this brought out very clearly in Hatch's Hibbert Lectures, from which we give an extract which is peculiarly apposite:

"The main subject-matter of this literary education was the poets. They were read, not only for their literary, but also for their moral value. They were read as we read the Bible. They were committed to memory. The minds of men were saturated by them. A quotation from Homer or from a tragic poet was apposite on all occasions and in every kind of society. Dio Chrysostom, in an account of his travels, tells how he came to the Greek colony of the Borysthenitae, on the farthest borders of the empire, and found that even in those remote settlements almost all the inhabitants knew the Iliad by heart, and that they did not care to hear about anything else."

(Hibbert Lectures, p. 30.) Cf. pp. 52, 53.

In the second century we have evidence enough of the way in which the verses of Homer were threaded through all the literature of the time. Tertullian tells us¹ that we must not be so much astonished at the liberties which the heretics take with the Scriptures when we find that secular writings are treated with the same freedom (cum de secularibus quoque scripturis exemplum praesto sit eiusmodi facilitatis). "In our own day, says Tertullian, we have seen the verses of Virgil wrought into an entirely new story. Further, the tale of Medea has been told in Virgilian verse. A relation of my own has Virgilianized the Tablet of Cebes. And are there not persons who are called Homer-Centonists, who by gathering verses far and wide make new compositions of their own?"

It is possible that Tertullian's comparison was due to Irenaeus; for we find the Valentinians compared by Irenaeus to these very Homerizers, and their method of hermeneutic combinations of texts and terms from all parts of the New Testament to the artificial conjunctions of the Homeric Cento. And, to illustrate what he means, Irenaeus (I. ix. 4) gives a specimen, where the subject is the descent of Hercules to fetch the dog Cerberus, and the lines are borrowed from all parts of the Odyssey and Iliad. It is interesting to notice the attempts of the translator

¹ De Praescript. Haeret, 39.

of Irenaeus to do the new poem into Latin hexameters¹. After reading this bit of diversion on the part of Irenaeus and his translator, we can believe anything of the second century; it is no longer strange that metrical glosses should occur, when we find men's minds so full of them; nor is it surprising, when we see the way that the translator of Irenaeus went to work, if we should find a doubtful or disputed quantity in the verse, as in the passage interpolated in the Bezan text.

But it is not merely in the glosses that have crept into the text of the New Testament that we trace the student of Homer; we suspect that there are some of the New Testament writers themselves that have felt his influence and reflected it in their speech. But be that as it may, we must certainly be prepared for such an influence in the accretions which occur so plentifully in Western New Testament texts.

A few concluding remarks may now be made as to the way in which we shall probably find the remainder of the solution of the riddle of the Western texts of the Gospels.

It is important to remember that we are dealing with a chronological problem; we have to determine the dates, or the superior and inferior limits, of certain textual phenomena. This chronology can be approached in three ways:

(1) The actual quotation of aberrant readings by second century Fathers. For instance, a Tatian reading must either have originated with Tatian or be antecedent to him: a Marcionite reading, if it contain definite Marcionite teaching, must have originated with, or be later than Marcion, and probably not much later. Thus we have a scale for the chronology of the readings which is marked with the names of such teachers as

Marcion,
Justin,
Tatian,
Montanus,
Irenaeus,
Tertullian &c.

¹ E.g. "Et senes et pueri et nondum nuptae puellae Plorantes multum ac si mortem iret ad ipsam," but perhaps the verses have suffered in transcription.

(2) We have the chronology of the Versions: where the primitive form of a version can be inferred from the MSS. which constitute its tradition, each version furnishes an inferior limit for the time of origin of a large group of aberrant readings. The order of the versions must be determined; it will probably be found that the three most closely connected versions stand in the order:

Old Latin, Old Syriac, Sahidic.

(3) We have to find the times of the separate hands that can be traced in readings and glosses, as the Homerizer, the first Gnostic hand, the Montanizer and the like.

Now, it is probable that no solution would be reached by working with a single scale taken out of the three; to reach success we must keep them all three in mind, and work with them placed side by side. The moment we do this, the burning questions appear; such as these:

Is the Old Latin earlier than Marcion?
Is the Curetonian Syriac older than Tatian?
Does the Homerizer antedate the Curetonian text?

These and similar questions are the crucial points of the enquiry: and we have already given suggestions of the way in which they are to be answered in our study of the body of glosses in the Acts. Probably the best way to proceed would be to deal with the final chapters of Luke where the intrusive glosses are so thick. We must test them and try to find out whether they are by a single hand. One or two of them are suspiciously metrical and Homeric. If we go back five verses from the Homeric gloss in Luke xxiii. 53 we find,

xxiii. 48,

τγπτοντές τα сτήθη και τα μετώπα γπεςτρεφάν PERCYTIENTES PECTORA ET FRONTES REVERTEBANTYR.

The man who wrote this expanded sentence seems to have had in his mind a Latin verse

reversi frontes et pectora percutiebant,

describing the wailing of the Trojan women over the death of Hector. But if this were the same hand as before, the attestation ought to shew signs of agreement in the two cases: in Luke xxiii. 53 it was D c theb: in the new case we have no traces in the Egyptian, but the ancestry of Cod. c once had the reading, for it has, by a happy fortune, erased pectora and left frontes. Here then is a second gloss by the same hand as the former.

If we work through the body of glosses we shall ultimately get a clear idea of the attestation of the collection, and be able to fix, with some closeness, the date of the glossator. But the problem is not solved by stating it; and we find that much searching of the extant Copies, Versions and Fathers is necessary before we can give the formal solution. Moreover, I find that it will probably be necessary for me to re-examine and perhaps to re-edit the extant Homeric Centones, and some associated documents which throw great light upon the textual questions of these last chapters of Luke. In our next chapter we shall take up a few points in dialect and palaeography which will help us towards a final settlement of the question.

CHAPTER XXIII.

ON THE COLOMETRY OF THE CODEX BEZAE.

SOMETHING ought to be said with regard to the line-division which prevails in the Codex Bezae, for it is certainly very ancient and often constitutes a traditional interpretation of the text, which is of the highest value.

The earliest known Greek texts contained in the famous Uncial MSS. of the fourth and fifth centuries are destitute of any but the most rudimentary division of sentences. It is true that a break in the sense is sometimes intimated by a slight space in the text, or the commencement of a new paragraph by a new line, or by thrusting out on the margin of the text the first letter in a new sentence which happens to fall on the margin. Sometimes, too, a catalogue of names, which is particularly hard to read in a continuous text, is found broken up into separate lines, as, for example, the genealogy in St Luke. But, in spite of these and similar attempts at interpunction, the early Uncials cannot be described as anything else than continuous texts.

When, however, the texts of the New Testament became regularly read and divided into sections, and especially when they were read in bilingual congregations, the attempt was made to break up the passage read into the proper limbs or cola: and this process so facilitated the translation of the Scripture, and the reading and understanding of what had been translated, that after a while the colometry became conventional, and was propagated from one Ms. to another, by interpunction, and from one Ms. to its descendants by copying the text line by line.

16

It is not then surprising that, as we read the text of the Codex Bezae, the conviction forces itself upon us that its colometry is very ancient.

Scrivener points this out (p. xvii.), remarking as follows:

"Now since it will appear clearly hereafter that the manuscript as it stands at present was closely and exactly copied from another, perhaps almost contemporary to itself, similarly divided in respect of $\sigma \tau i \chi o \iota$ though not similarly paged, it will follow that the model from which the latter was taken is older still, dating perhaps as early as or earlier than the time of Origen. The reader will not doubt that the ancient $\sigma \tau i \chi o \iota$ were being gradually dissolved in course of time by successive transcribers, if he pays any attention to their actual condition in Codex Bezae."

There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of Scrivener's statement, for which the evidence in the shape of dropped and repeated lines is abundantly sufficient. The restoration of the precise primitive colometry is, however, not so easy: though the scribe of the Bezan text has done his best to help us by means of interpunction in cases where his lines do not agree with the primitive model: and in almost every case where there is a dividing point in the middle of a line in the Bezan text, it is because two cola have been run together, or because in some other way the regular colometry has been deserted.

I do not hesitate to say that I believe this primitive colometry to be very early. For it is not confined to Codex Bezae. Take for example Codex k and study its interpunction, and we shall find that it is not original nor arbitrary, but that it is in the main the same as existed in the ancestral text from which Codex Bezae is derived. Here is a specimen, taken from a random page of Cod. k:

Mark x. 35 et accedunt ad eum iacobus et iohannes fili zepdaei dicen tes magister quod petierimus .

37 dona nobis • et dixerunt illi da nobis • ut unus a dextram

38 et unus a sinistra • hī autem respondens dixit illis • nescitis quit petatis potestis bibere ca licem etc.

Here are five points of distinction in the sense of the passage:

how closely they coincide with the structure of the Bezan text may be seen by transcribing the lines of D at the same place:

et accesserunt ad eum iacobus
et iohannes · fili zebedei
et dicunt illi magister
uolumus ut quodcumque petierimus te
praestes nobis
ad ille dixit illis praestabo uobis
et dixerunt ei da nobis
ut unus ad dexteram tuam · et unus ad sinistrā
sedeamus in gloria tua
Et ihs respondens ait illis
nescitis quid petatis potestis bibere calicem.

Notice that the interpunction of k not only agrees closely with the D lines, but that where k has dropped portions of the text, it is whole lines of D that are missing.

Another instance will perhaps make the point clearer. Let us turn to Mark viii. 35: here the text of D is arranged thus:

animam suam saluam facere • perdet eam • propter euangelium saluam faciet eam,

and either the first hand or a revising second hand has added, for the missing line, partly at the end of the first line and partly between the lines, the words

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{qui autem} \\ \text{perdiderit eam.} \end{array}$

Now turn to Cod. k and we find the passage given thus:

salua re animam suam perdet illā propter euangelium autem saluauit illam,

where it is seen that the line dropped in D and afterwards restored is dropped also in k and not restored.

Clearly then, if the Western text could be edited in its primitive colometry, it would be an advantage from the standpoint of criticism, and would assist us in distinguishing between interpolations and omissions.

Moreover, we may strongly suspect that the same colometry underlies the Curetonian Syriac; and that traces of it can still be

seen in the arrangement of that peculiar text. For example, in Matt. xvii. 12, 13 Codex Bezae has transposed two lines of text over two other lines, thus producing the following effect:

τότε ςγνήκαν οι μαθηταί ότι περι ϊωάννος τος Βαπτίστος είπεν αυτοίς ότως και ο ξίος τος ανθρωπος • μελλεί παςχί τη αυτώ.

Now the Cureton text has restored the right arrangement of the verses, but it betrays heredity from the erroneous arrangement in repeating the word $o\~v\tau\omega\varsigma$ at the end of the sentence after $\epsilon\~l\tau\epsilon\nu$ $a\~v\tauo\~l\varsigma$ ("concerning John the Baptist he spake to them so"). Now this awakens our suspicion that the colometry of D is behind the arrangement of the Curetonian text¹.

Such a theory will require a more extended examination than can be given in these pages; but we may easily find some tests and illustrations of it; and first let us open the text at random, say at Luke ix. 32. Let us transcribe a few lines from Codex Bezae, marking by a vertical bar the places where the punctuator's mark occurs in the Syriac.

petrus autem
et qui cum eo erant · erant grauati somno |
euigilantes autem uiderunt gloriam eius |
et duos uiros qui simul stabant cum eo |
et factum est cum separarentur ab eo |
dixit petrus ad ihm | magister
bonum est nobis hic esse | uis
facio hic tria tabernacula | unum tibi |
et unum moysi | et unum heliae
nesciens quid dicit · | haec autem eo dicente |
facta est nubs et obumbrauit eos |

The colometry in the two texts is seen to be closely parallel: in the sixth line, 'magister' makes a slight displacement, and in the seventh, the Syriac does not render 'vis.' The Bezan text has slight spaces for the mention of the three tabernacles, and in the last line but one it has a dividing point where the Cureton text has one, intimating an original line in the words

nesciens quid dicit.

¹ The reader will be interested to know that the displacement is found also in the Old Latin texts a b c e ff^1 ff^2 g^1 , and perhaps in Justin.

We may add a few striking instances of colometric agreement between the texts in question in order to make the point at issue clearer.

In Matt. xxi. 18 the final word in the verse (esuriit) is marked in the Cureton text with a point before and a point after, indicating that the word is a colon or line by itself. Turning to the Codex Bezae, where the Western colometry is so well preserved, we find

mane autem transiens in ciuitatem esuriit • et uidens &c.

where again the point that follows esuriit shews that it once ended a line.

Next let us turn to John vi. 64, where the Latin is

qui sunt qui non credunt et quis esset etc.

The first line, and by consequence the first word (et) of the next line, has been lost in Cod. e and in the Curetonian text. Note the agreement in line-omission between the Old Latin and Old Syriac texts: the fact is that Cod. e and the Old Syriac are closely related.

Again, let us turn to John vii. 5, where the Greek is

οιδε γαρ οι αδελφοι αγτογ επιστεγςαν εις αγτον τοτε λεγει αγτοις...

Here the inserted $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon$ is simply a translator's 'tunc,' such as we so often find at the beginning of sentences in the Old Latin: but by mishap it got into the wrong colon, and so the effect produced was that the brethren of our Lord did not at that time believe on him. So suitable was the insertion, that it becomes a permanent Western addition, and is gradually pushed further and further back into the verse; it is added before fratres by a $c ff^2 q$, after eius by efl, after crediderunt by bd. Moreover the error passed into the Curetonian Syriac and into the Tatian Harmony, if we may judge from the Arabic ("ad hoc usque tempus"). It is just from such points as these that we may safely argue, when we are discussing the genealogy of MSS.; and we can see here an undoubted Western error, which in the first instance is due

merely to the colometric arrangement, travelling as far East as it was possible for it to travel.

In John iv. 24 we have a passage in the Curetonian text which Tischendorf rightly describes by the words "mire confusa sunt": he does not, however, notice that the confusion is capable of resolution, and that we can determine its cause. The genesis of the error is as follows: the Western colometry had divided the verse in the following manner:

spiritus deus et adorantes in spiritu et ueritate adorare oportet.

i.e. "God is a spirit: and those who worship Him in spirit it behoves also to worship in truth."

The Curetonian text took up the misunderstanding induced by the colometry and gave the sequence "Deus enim spiritus est, et illi qui adorant eum spiritu, etiam oportet eos adorare veritate." Upon this text a corrector went to work, erasing the final *veritate* and suggesting for insertion the correct reading

qui adorant eum spiritu et veritate.

All of this goes into the text, with the following conglomeration as the final result:

"Deus enim spiritus est et illi qui adorant eum spiritu etiam oportet eos adorare qui adorant eum spiritu et veritate."

But, as the comparison of the texts shews, we must regard the Western colometry as the prime cause of the error.

Many more instances may be given of similar phenomena. It is rare for the Curetonian text to do anything without Western assistance, and in most cases the Western bilingual is at the bottom of the matter. If the Cureton text, recklessly and to the damage of the sense, drops a colon, the omission will generally be supported or explained by the Old Latin: e.g. in John v. 28 the Curetonian text drops ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα. A reference to the Bezan text shews it to be a primitive line. If the Western text repeats a line or two, in its earliest copies, the chances are that the Curetonian text will shew signs of it. Take for instance John v. 39. There is reason to believe that in the early Western Greek there was a repetition of the words ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον

ἔχειν καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ (probably three lines repeated ex errore). Consequent upon the repetition we have a double translation in Cod. a and Cod. b, so that the passage runs as below: and not only so, but the repeated passage, in two distinct renderings, turns up in the Curetonian text. The reader may compare the versions.

Cod: α .

in quibus vos existimatis in illis vitam aeternam habere: illae sunt quae testimonium dicunt de me. in quibus putatis vos vitam habere: hae sunt quae de me testificantur.

Cod. b.

quoniam putatis vos in ipsis vitam aeternam habere: et ipsae sunt, quae testimonium perhibent de me. in quibus putatis vos vitam habere: haec sunt quae testificantur de me.

The Curetonian text is substantially the same as these Latin texts, omitting, naturally enough, the words 'sunt quae' in the last line: and the Armenian text has preserved a part of the repetition (probably from a Syriac original), for it reads the repeated part, excepting the last line. Does it not seem reasonable to refer the whole confusion to line-repetition in Western texts? But if the hypothesis of conflate renderings be preferred, we must still say that the Curetonian text owes its version to a Western copy.

Nor is the interest in this primitive colometry confined to textual questions: it has its bearing, as we have seen above, on the interpretation of the text. For a good example, we may take the first verses in St John's Gospel, allowing for the lines in Cod. Bezae and the punctuation in the Curetonian text, and restoring the primitive Western arrangement as follows:

Έν ἀρχῆ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. οὖτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῆ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν

πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲν ο γέγονεν ἐν αὐτοῦ ζωή ἐστιν.

Here it is clear that $\partial \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \gamma o \nu \epsilon \nu$, which is marked by dividing points before and after, is a primitive line, evidently the remaining part of the preceding sentence: but unfortunately the second point became lost in the tradition of the text, and as a result the words became attached to the following line, so producing

ο γέγονεν έν αὐτῷ ζωή ἐστιν.

The text of Codex Bezae shews that this cannot have been the primitive colometry. Yet the new arrangement of the text has been made the basis of a good deal of exegetical subtlety!

Perhaps we have said enough to shew that there existed an early Western colometry, probably in the first bilingual (i.e. Graeco-Latin) text: that there is reason to believe that this text has by means of its colometric errors, and its actual transmitted line-division, affected the Old Syriac and probably all other Syriac texts: and if this be the case, we have another argument in favour of the derivation of the Curetonian text from an early Roman copy¹.

¹ In a note appended to his edition of the Acts of Perpetua (p. 97) Mr J. A. Robinson has pointed out a number of passages of the New Testament which are quoted in the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons in a form which suggests retranslation from a Latin Bible. Moreover he shews very strong reasons for believing that this Latin text was already divided into cola; for the words of the Epistle (§ 22) τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς ἐξιόντος ἐκ τῆς νηδύος τοῦ χριστοῦ imply that in John vii. 37, 38 the words ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ were attached to the previous sentence πρός με καὶ πινέτω. And this is precisely the colometric division and interpretation which we find in Codd. d e. If the colometric Latin text was current in the Rhône valley in a.p. 177 we may speak confidently of the antiquity of the Old Latin version.

CHAPTER XXIV.

ON THE ABBREVIATIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE CODEX BEZAE.

THE conventional forms of abbreviation of the Greek and Latin sides, respectively, of the Codex Bezae will be found roughly tabulated in Scrivener's account of the text, the Greek forms on p. xviii.: and the Latin on pp. xliii., xliv. There is, therefore, no need to repeat them; but a few remarks may perhaps be made on the subject.

The abbreviations which we find in Greek texts (and the same thing is true of the Latin texts, which shew an early agreement with the Greek) are the result of a tendency of the scribes to represent often-repeated words by a single sign; we may reasonably suppose, then, that the conventional abbreviations have been arrived at gradually, and not per saltum. It is more than likely that the word $\Theta\epsilon\delta$ was abbreviated before the word $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\nu}\mu a$, and the word $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\nu}\mu a$ probably before any one thought of abbreviating ${}^{\prime}I\sigma\rho a\dot{\eta}\lambda$ or ${}^{\prime}I\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu\sigma a\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu$. For example, in the Codex Bezae we do not find any abbreviation at all for such forms as $\Delta a\beta i\delta$, ${}^{\prime}I\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu\sigma a\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu$, &c. Hence we are entitled to assume that the number of conventional forms has been arrived at gradually.

In the next place we can see that the final form which was conventionally recognized has been arrived at, in many cases, by a number of separate attempts at the abbreviation of the repeated word. Thus the Codex Bezae shews us variations of a peculiar character; we find $\pi a \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$ sometimes written as $\pi a \rho^1$ though the conventional form is $\pi \eta \rho$, shewing that two attempts were made to abbreviate, by leaving out the middle consonant

¹ E.g. John xiv. 29; xv. 2.

and one or other of the vowels. In the same way we find $I\eta\sigma\sigma\hat{v}s$ shortened into $\iota\sigma$, the usual form, and $\iota\eta\sigma$, which we recognize at once as very ancient, for it is the same which appears in Latin as ihs, where the middle letter is commonly supposed to be an h, but is really the Greek H. The misunderstanding is very early, as may be seen from the attempts in early MSS, to write the name as if it contained a Latin h: thus Scrivener points out in Codex Laudianus the occurrence of the forms $\imath hesus$ and hiesum: where the error is patent enough; the Greek letter having become an aspirate. It is clear, then, that behind the conventional abbreviations found in our early Uncial texts there is an array of earlier forms, attaching themselves to the more commonly repeated words and to the more sacred names.

But this is not all: a study of the Codex Bezae and kindred documents, whether Latin or Greek, will, I think, shew that in the early stages a single sign was employed for all cases of the substantives abbreviated. Now this may be seen in three ways: First, when a scribe finds an abbreviation of this kind, susceptible of misunderstanding or misreading, he frequently writes the word out at length, so as to avoid the misunderstanding; but sometimes he continues to copy the superposed bar or curve which intimates an abbreviation in the text. We may prove this from the Codex Bezae.

In Luke vii. 3 we have

qui erat illi honoratus et audiens de ihs,

where we notice that the scribe has given us the nominative case instead of the ablative, clearly because the abbreviation \overline{ihs} stood for all cases.

So in John xvii. 3 we have quem misisti ihs xpm, and Acts xiii. 32 suscitavit dnm ihs xpm. But we often find the word written in full, under the sign of abbreviation, as Scrivener has pointed out: "thus dei is met with 122 times (but never in the Acts); deo 24 times (in the Acts only vii. 40; x. 4); deum only in John vi. 46; x. 33." These instances from the Codex Bezae can be paralleled from other sources.

But the next way in which we see the truth of our hypothesis

as to the existence of an early single sign of abbreviation for all cases of the noun is that it often happens that an ignorant scribe, in attempting to reduce the abbreviation to a more usual form, produces barbarisms. Perhaps the best cases of this kind occur in the old Latin Codex k. If we turn to Dr Sanday's account of this Ms. in Old Latin Biblical Texts, No. ii., we shall see this clearly enough: we may transcribe a passage (p. clviii.) by way of illustration:

"The usage of the Ms. in regard to the sacred names is very peculiar and striking. There is great variety of forms, though some will be found to predominate. Here even more than elsewhere all the rules of grammar appear to be set at defiance: any form is made to stand for any case."

Dr Sanday then collects from the MS. the various abbreviations, viz.:

DS = DEUS.

DI = DEUS, DEI, IHS.

 $\overline{DE} = \overline{IHS}$.

DEI (thus, with the mark of abbreviation).

 $\overline{DM} = DEUM$.

DOM = DEI, DEUS (?), IHS (?), DEO, DEUM, DOMINUS, DOMINI, DOMINO, DOMINUM, DOMINE.

Also DOM⁸, DOM⁰, DOMⁿ, DOM^e.

HI=HIESUS, HIESU, HIESUM.

Also HI", IH", HI", HI", IH".

HIS-HIESUS, HIESU, HIESUM.

HIS = HIESUS.

HS'=HIESUS.

. HI = HIESUS.

HS'=HIESUS.

HS=HIESUS, HIESUM.

An examination of this list will shew that the early forms of abbreviation were very comprehensive and that much confusion resulted; one way out of the confusion seems to have been to attach a small letter to the abbreviation by which the termination could be indicated.

The third way in which we are confirmed in our belief of the existence of early simple and comprehensive forms of abbreviation is that the earliest MSS. shew signs of textual depravation which

can hardly result from any other cause than this. For instance, it was common in the second century to read John i. 18 in the form

MONOTENHO OC

in place of the received text

O MONOFENHO YC.

It is conceivable that we have here a misunderstanding of a primitive abbreviation which stood for all cases alike, and in this particular instance represents the genetive case $(\mu o \nu o \gamma e \nu \eta) s \theta e o \hat{v}$. The variant $\theta e o s$ is not explicable by the supposition of a misreading of γc , for it is extremely doubtful whether $\gamma o c$ was abbreviated at all in the earliest texts: and it may be suspected that $\gamma o c$ is merely an expansion derived from the Latin, unigenitus filius Dei.

Perhaps the instance which we have selected by way of illustration is an unfortunate one, in that the explanation may be challenged as falling under the condemnation of what Dr Hort calls "verdicts of oracular instinct1"; but whether the illustration be a good one or a bad one, satisfactory or unsatisfactory, I think the point as to the nature of the early abbreviations of the text of the New Testament, and the misunderstandings to which they were liable, can be considered as established by the various instances to which we can draw attention.

In the Codex Bezae there are numerous various readings which have arisen from the confusion of the conventional abbreviations inter se. Whatever may have been the primitive abbreviations for the Latin deus and dominus, it is demonstrable that they were frequently in confusion. We may prove this by some selected cases.

In Acts xiii. 5 we have

adnuntiabant verbum $\overline{\mathrm{di}}\ (\tau ov\ \overline{\kappa v}).$

Here the Latin text is certainly right, for there is no variation worth mentioning in the critical apparatus; but the accommodated Greek text has read the Latin as *domini*.

¹ Two Dissertations, p. vii.

Turn next to Acts xiii. 43: where we have the opposite form to the preceding; and where the gloss

transire uerbum dni

is the equivalent of

διελθείν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Without venturing to say which of these is the correct reading, we may remark their present divergence, and suspect that it is due to the misreading of a sign of abbreviation.

Next turn to Acts xiii. 46, where we have

loqui verbum $\overline{\mathrm{dni}}\ (\tau o \hat{v}\ \overline{\theta v}),$

in which we see the same confusion: here the Greek is certainly right, and *domini* is a false correction of an abbreviated *dei*.

In Acts xvi. 34 we have

credens in dno

as the rendering of

πεπιστευκώς έπὶ τὸν θεὸν.

It is almost certain that $\theta\epsilon\delta_s$ and not $\kappa\nu\rho\iota\sigma_s$ is the right word in this passage; may we not then say that \overline{dno} is a misreading of the abbreviation for deo? Sometimes we may find the two Latin forms confused in almost adjacent passages: in John xx. 13 we have quia tulerunt \overline{dom} , where the equivalent is certainly $\kappa\nu\rho\iota\sigma_s$, but in xx. 17 et \overline{dom} meum et \overline{dom} uestrum, where the abbreviation no less certainly stands for $\theta\epsilon\delta\nu$.

Perhaps these instances will suffice (that we be not further tedious) to shew how the Western text has been affected by the transcriptional confusion of its primitive abbreviations.

Can we be wrong in saying further that in any case of variation between the parallel forms of $\theta\epsilon\delta$ s and $\kappa\nu\rho\iota\sigma$ s, the authority of Western texts is the minimum? I know that here we are on difficult ground, and that the reader is already thinking of a famous disputed text, but I do not hesitate to say that I propose to read $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\nu$ $\tau\sigma\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\sigma\nu$ in Acts xx. 28, regarding the adverse evidence of D, E, Irenaeus, and the general Western company as of very small weight upon the opposite side of the question. And this statement is not made in consequence of any special prejudice in favour of the combination of the two oldest uncials (8B), with which the received text happens at this point to agree.

CHAPTER XXV.

On double translations of the Greek text in the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions.

WE will first make a table of some of the most remarkable of these double translations in the four Gospels.

Matt. ii. 8	venite renuntiate	Tatian (arab) syr ^{cur}
Matt. viii. 5	rogavitet obsecravit	Syreur
Matt. xiv. 32	cessavit et quievit	Tatian (arm) [cf. a b d]
Matt. xv. 23	sequitur et clamat	Tatian (arm) syr b
Matt. xix. 25	stupebant et timuerunt	$a b [d f] c e ff^2 g^2 \operatorname{syr}^{\operatorname{cur}}$
Matt. xxv. 34	hereditate possidete	d
Mark iii. 5	ira indignationis	d
Mark v. 13	impetum fecerunt et ceciderunt	b e Tatian (arab) Peshito
Mark x. 26	admirabanturtimidi	Tatian (arab)
Mark x. 51	domine rabbi	D $a \ b \ f^2 \ i \ \text{Tatian (arab)}$
Mark xiv. 38	alacer et promptus	Tatian (arab) (arm)
Luke i. 17	perfectam consummatam	[ef. $d \ a \ b$]
Luke ii. 48	dolentes et tristes	$a \ d \ e \ ff^2 \ g^1 \ l \ q \ \text{syr}^{\text{cur}} $ Tatian (arm)
Luke iv. 20	abiit ac sedit	Tatian (arab)
Luke v. 8	rogo exi	cdef Tatian (arab) Peshito
Luke viii. 8	bonam et uberam	a c d e syr Tatian (arm)
Luke ix. 61	ire renuntiare	$a g^1 \operatorname{syr}^{\operatorname{cur}} \operatorname{Iren}^{\operatorname{lat}}$
Luke x. 39	venit et sedit	Tatian (arab) syr ^{cur}
Luke xii. 13	terram et hereditatem	syreur
Luke xv. 4	vadit et quaerit	a d e f syr ^{eur} Tatian (arab)
Luke xvi. 2	veni redde	syrcur
Luke xvi. 24	in ustione ignis	d
Luke xviii. 5	vado et devindico	d
Luke xxiii. 28	plangere et lugere	[d]
John xi. 39	accedite et auferte	Tatian (arm)
John xvii. 23	perfecti consummati	d
John xxi. 7	misit se et salibit	d
John xx. 16	domine magister	d

Now a survey of these peculiar renderings will shew that there is a good deal of internal connection between pairs of them, which cannot be explained away by any theory of assimilation or cross-references. For let us examine some of them closely: the first reference (Matt. ii. 8) shews that Tatian and the Curetonian text agree in the formula venite renuntiate as a translation of ἀπαγγείλατε. But that it is not merely the trick of the first Syriac translator may be seen from the somewhat similar case where, in Luke ix. 61, we find ire renuntiare as a rendering of ἀποτάξασθαι in the Old Latin, the Old Syriac and in the translation of Irenaeus. It seems then that the reading of the Curetonian Syriac (καμκ κόκ) is arrived at by means of a Latin rendering which had translated ἀποτάξασθαι by renuntiare instead of abrenuntiare, and added the expansion ite.

Take the next case in the list: we find that the Curetonian Syriac in Matt. viii. 5 has rendered the verb $\pi a \rho a \kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega}$ by rogo et obsecro. How thoroughly conventional this is in Latin may be seen not only from Latin inscriptions, but from the text of the Old Latin Gospels. The Bezan text has frequent expansions by means of such a translation, which give rise to subsequent additions in the Greek, or to subtractions in the Latin, and not always to subtractions of the superfluous word, but sometimes some other word in the sentence. The object in such cases is to make the Greek and Latin as nearly as possible equal in the number of words.

For example, in Acts xxi. 39 δέομαί σου is rendered by rogo obsecro: and our list of selected double readings shews us ἔξελθε rendered by rogo exi (Luke v. 8) both in the Bezan text and in the Arabic Tatian.

In the next passage, Matt. xiv. 32, which is from the Armenian Tatian, ἐκόπασεν has been rendered by two almost synonymous words: this of itself is suspicious, for it looks like a case of African pleonasm; and the suspicion thus awakened is confirmed by noticing that the Codex Vercellensis, the Codex Veronensis, and others have cessavit, but the Codex Bezae has quievit.

The passage Matt. xv. 23 shews a similar expansion in the Curetonian text, the Armenian Tatian and in the Codex Veronensis. The errors can hardly be independent, and, if that be

admitted, then either the Curetonian text has been drawn from a Western copy, or one of the great Western copies has been touched up by a Syriac hand.

In Matt. xix. 25 we find the translators in a perplexity over the rendering of $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu\tau o$. The Bezan translation is certainly peculiar, consisting of an imperfect tense followed by a perfect: Codd. a,b read mirabantur et timebant valde; Cod. f mirabantur valde, as if by the erasure of one word from the combination in a,b. We may be sure, then, that there was a primitive double rendering in the Latin.

On turning to Acts xiii. 12, we find a double rendering of $\epsilon k\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\sigma\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$ by miratus est stupens, which is similar in character to the passage in Matthew, and has given rise to a reactionary error in the Greek text. So that we are confirmed in believing the error to be truly Western and Latin. But it appears in the Curetonian text; and not only so, but, on looking at the Tatian Arabic in Mark x. 26 (admirabantur timidi), we can see traces and signs of a similar error. In Mark vi. 52 we find $\epsilon \xi i\sigma \tau a\nu\tau \sigma$ translated in a similar manner by stupebant et mirabantur, and καὶ εθαύμαζον added to the Greek. Is it not the simplest solution to carry all these errors back to a primitive Graeco-Latin text?

Matt. xxv. 34 shews the traces of a primitive Latin pleonastic rendering of $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\rho\nu\rho\mu\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$: we should be suspicious at once of such a rendering as that in Codex Bezae (hereditate possidete): it must be either a conflation, or a primitive African pleonasm: that it is the latter is seen from the fact that in Acts vii. 5 the Bezan text gives us

possessionem heredetatis

as a rendering of $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\rho\nu\rho\mu(a\nu)$. We could hardly find a better example of the usage of the early African writers. Codd. ab remove the superfluous 'hereditate' in Matthew. But the Curetonian Syriac in Luke xii. 14 shews signs of having had two words in its primitive text, for it reads "terram et hereditatem," where 'terram' seems to stand for 'possessionem.' We suspect then again that the Curetonian pleonastic renderings are not all of them original.

In Mark v. 13 the Arabic Tatian has et cucurrit grex ad ver-

ticem et praecipitatus est in mare, which seems to represent the same Syriac as in the Peshito (cucurrit et cecidit), the Curetonian text being wanting. But this translation by means of a double verb is in Cod. b, fecerunt impetu[m] ire...et ceciderunt, and in Cod. e, ierunt cum impetu...et ceciderunt. The Syriac text seems to rest again on a Western bilingual.

Mark x. 51 shews a double translation of $\dot{\rho}a\beta\beta ovvi$ by domine rabbi. This reading has coloured some of the oldest of the Western texts: so that it is hardly to be described as a conflation. For we find, on referring to John xx. 16 in the Codex Bezae, that the same word is expounded to mean domine magister ("illa dicit ei ebraice rabboni quod dicitur domine magister"). We may be sure, then, that the primitive Latin version had rendered the word pleonastically.

What are we to say, then, when we find that the Tatian text has given us in the Arabic just such a double rendering? For in Mark x. 51 we find

Domine mi, et praeceptor, &c.

The primitive rendering of κατεσκευασμένον in Luke i. 17 was pleonastic, as we may see by comparing the parallel texts. For, though the text of D says

praeparare domino plebem consummatam,

Cod. a prefers to read *perfectum*, and b *perfectam*; we suspect then a primitive rendering

perfectam consummatam,

which would be decidedly African in character.

And our list of double readings shews us that at John xvii. 23 we have a very similar case, where the line

ΪΝΑ ως ΙΝ ΤΕΤΕλΙωΜΕΝΟΙ

is rendered by the Bezan text

VT SINT PERFECTI CONSVMMATI.

Here we have no Syrian confirmation as far as I know, nor is it necessary that all of such compound readings should pass into the Syriac. What we notice is that the Old Latin texts originate

¹ In the passage in John we have a, 'domine'; e, 'magister et domine'; ff², 'magister, domine'; and of course, in the Greek of D, κύριε διδάσκαλε.

such readings freely, and in some cases pass them on to other versions, either directly or by means of a Greek text that has been doctored from its translation.

How wide this influence is may be seen from the gloss in Luke ii. 48, the effects of which are felt in almost all Old Latin texts, as well as in the Curetonian text and in Tatian. There is no reason to believe that this variant has any Greek support, except by accidental reflection from the Latin; and it will be difficult to maintain that it is not a genuine Latin one, although we see that all the Syriac texts have been influenced by it.

So in Luke xv. 4, where the vulgar Latin origin of the gloss is almost evident from the language (with which we may compare the *vado et devindico* in Luke xviii. 5). Yet here also we have the two Old Syriac versions in line.

We conclude, then, that some of the double renderings which we observe in the old so-called Western texts are Latinisms; and that the Syriac versions owe them to Western bilingual influence; and since we observe the same phenomenon in this group of readings which has been so often detected elsewhere, viz. the signs of an internal nexus between the Curetonian text and the Tatian Harmony, we are again brought to suspect that both these texts are to be traced ultimately to a Western bilingual origin; and that they are not independent one of the other.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Some peculiar Forms and Spellings in the Codex Bezae.

i. On a curious African form of the verb 'habeo.'

Every one who has worked at all at the study of the textual authority of the various versions of the New Testament will know how labyrinthine is the question of the tenses that are used, and how difficult it is to determine in each case the Greek tense which stood in the translator's copy.

Not only is the question affected by the Semitic instincts of the first composers who write Hebrew constructions in Greek, which they leave to later hands to emend and reform; but, as we have shewn abundantly in previous investigations, the fact that the tenses in Greek are not parallel to those in Latin has produced reactions upon the Greek text which are of the nature of the most deep-seated of textual errors.

But this is not all: the primitive Latin translation was not made into the classical tongue but into the tongue of the people, and this tongue is almost a different language to the polite Latin which scholars study. The vulgar not only used different words, but they used the same words differently as far as force and meaning are concerned. Their verbs, for instance, were far gone in the process of decline from full inflection; and, in particular, the future tense had become so like to the present tense in many verbs, partly by the disappearance of the futures in -bo, partly by the thinning of the characteristic vowels, that the auxiliary future, in its pre-Romance form, had already been called into service when the first Latin rendering of the New Testament was made. It becomes very important to collect and classify all the colloquial forms which we can find in our Old Latin texts, and to use them

both for the advancement of philological study, and for the interpretation of the texts in which they occur.

In working through the Bezan text, which is the best monument that we have of the Old Latin Gospels, I was struck with the recurrence of a peculiar form of the verb *habeo*. When, for example, one found in Matt. v. 46

quam mercedem habebetis,

the first thought was that it was a simple palaeographical error of a dittographed syllable, so that habetis had been made into something very like a future tense, and, as was to be expected, the Greek had been corrected to match the supposed future from $\xi \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ to $\xi \xi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. But as one read through the codex, the error repeated itself so often and so variously that the theory of palaeographical cause broke down under the strain; and although it was perfectly true that the revising hand in the Greek had made the same assumption, viz. that habebo was a future tense, the second thought came that, perhaps, after all, it was not a future but an African form of the present. Let us then look at some of the cases where the doubtful word occurs.

In Matt. vi. 2 we have again

mercedem non habebitis,

and here the Greek has not been tampered with; it shews

μισθὸν οὖκ ἔχετε.

Next turn to John vi. 53

non habebitis in uobis uitam,

where the Greek is ἔχετε.

In John xvi. 22

nunc quidem tristitiam habebitis,

the Greek should be $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, but has been corrected under the influence of the Latin to $\tilde{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$.

In Acts xviii. 18 we have

habebebat enim orationem,

and I think these five instances will shew, and especially the last, that we are not dealing with a palaeographical blunder, but with an actual verb form.

Now if this be the case, we must look for further traces of the form, on the hypothesis that in many cases it has been corrected away. Are there any such signs that the eccentric form once stood more regularly than it now does in the Old Latin tradition of the New Testament text? Let us examine the Codex Bezae on the point.

In Luke xv. 4 the text is

TIC ANOPHIOC $\varepsilon \tilde{z}$ YMWN OC $\varepsilon \tilde{z} \varepsilon i$ QVIS EX VOBIS HOMO QVI HABET.

In John xiv. 30 the Latin text is

iam non multa loquar uobiscum uenit enim huius mundi princeps et in me non habet nihil [inuenire].

The text of this passage has undergone some peculiar changes: and the attestation of the variants is conflicting: but we can see that correctors have been at work to change the present tenses into futures (veniet, habebit): for amongst the Old Latins fg we find veniet; and the Arabic Tatian has both veniet and habebit. We suspect then that the trouble began with a reading habebit in the Vulgar Latin: and that at a very early period this doubtful word was read as a future.

ii. On the primitive translation of the word 'disciple' in the Old Latin.

The first translation which was made of the Gospels and Acts did not render the word $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \dot{\eta}_s$ by the Latin discipulus but by the participle discens. This has been pointed out by Dr Sanday in his study of the Old Latin Codex k. He says¹, "at the back of k is an older form of the Version still: a form not much dissimilar from k, but with some features of greater antiquity; a form which had systematically discentes for discipuli; felix for beatus, etc."

The same thing might have been suspected from the instances of the use of the word given in Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 107.

¹ Old Latin Biblical Texts, II. p. xc.

For Rönsch quotes instances of its use not only from the Codex Bezae, but from Codd. b c; and from Irenaeus and Tertullian.

I have a few words to say concerning this form, because it is one of the many little details which so constantly turn up in attestation of the theory of derivation of all Latin copies from a single primitive rendering.

Suppose, for example, we are comparing Codices d and e in the Acts: we soon find that there is a common root to the two manuscripts; and that much of the earlier common type that underlies the two texts can be recovered. It is interesting to see that the scribe of E also found the form discens in his manuscript, and in Acts vi. 5 we catch him altering the Greek to $\mu av\theta av\acute{o}v\tau\omega v$, because he did not realize that discens could be a proper rendering of $\mu a\theta\eta\tau\dot{\eta}s$.

The same form is also found in Cod. e of the Gospels, as may be seen from Luke xvi. 8 "dixit autem ad discentes suos."

We will now shew that it must have been in the ancestry of a number of other Old Latin Codices of the Gospels, besides $b\ c\ d\ e\ k$ to which we have referred above.

Suppose we turn to Luke xix. 37, which in the Bezan text stands

ad discensum montis oliuarum coepit omnis multitudo discipulorum gaudentes laudare deum etc.

For 'discipulorum' there stood originally 'discentium'; but this, under the influence of the words in the previous line 'ad discensum,' was easily changed into 'descendentium,' so that it read "the whole multitude of those going down the mountain began to praise God, etc." Accordingly f g^1 still read 'discentium,' not having fallen into the error: the codex g^2 reads 'descendentium,' so does the Amiatinus: the codex Fuldensis 'discendentium,' etc. There is, therefore, no doubt about the original reading, nor about the genesis of the error. But, as often happens, when a text has been corrupted in some respect, the short and drastic method of dealing with the difficulty is to leave the corrupted word or sentence out, so we find in the present case that the MSS. $a\ c\ i\ l$ have omitted the word; and this is tantamount to a proof that they also at some time read 'discendentium,' and therefore

had 'discentes' in their ancestry. We knew this already of Cod. c: our list now includes $abcdefg^1g^2ikl$. Nor is this all, for we find the Curetonian Syriac in the same company, for the omission of the word: and we have one more suggestion of the Latin or Graeco-Latin text that lies behind this venerable translation.

iii. On a curious phonetic change in the dialect of the translator

of the Old Latin Version.

In the text of the Codex Bezae there are some signs of an interchange between the m and p sounds, which seems to be incapable of any explanation except a phonetic one.

For example, in Acts xiii. 34 we have

suscitauit eum a portuis,

as if the last word were almost equivalent in sound to 'mortuis.'
In Luke xiv. 1 we have the reverse error,

manducare manem

for 'panem': the equivalence of the sounds being seen from the fact that the errors take place in either direction, m for p or p for m.

patres uestri manducauerunt panem in deserto.

From this the Greek text is then doctored, so as to bring in τὸν ἄρτον to match 'panem': and finally 'mannam' gets inserted, probably by a later hand, at the end of the sentence after 'deserto.'

Now, the antiquity of the error can be seen by the fact that 'panem' has been added in the four Latin texts a b d e. But further than this, it turns up in the Curetonian text, where it has displaced $\tau \delta$ $\mu \acute{a} \nu \nu a$, which had not been restored in the text from which the materials of the Curetonian text were derived. If this explanation be correct, we have a decisive instance of the existence of Latin readings in the Curetonian text.

It would be rash to identify on such narrow data the nationality of the translator. But we may point out that, at all events, the circumstances are not adverse to the theory of a Carthaginian hand. For if the two sounds approximated, it must have been by the means of an agreement with the sound of the letter b. That the Punic speech, like the modern Arabic, tended to replace the p sound by b is seen from two inscriptions from Leptis, cited by Schröder¹, where medicus is equated to Normalian, which is clearly the Hebrew Normalian. And the occurrence of an element of the b sound along with m^2 may be seen from the cases cited by Schröder from the Poenulus of Plautus where

It is quite possible, then, that the confusion which we have noted as surviving in the Bezan text between m and p is a trace of the Punic dialect. For in two of the instances quoted the betacized m is a final letter, so that the case is quite different from the inserted sound which we find in such a word, say, as Lampsacus, where the change in the consonant is due to the following sibilant.

We leave it, therefore, as a point to be enquired into further, whether the Vulgar Latin of North Africa did not betacize the *m*-sound³. If it did, we have something like the same phonetic phenomenon surviving in the Codex Bezae.

iv. On a confusion between est and venit in the primitive form of the Old Latin New Testament.

A study of the various Old Latin texts will bring to light a

¹ Die Phönizische Sprache, p. 113.

² Cf. the phonetic changes by which Cod. b made medianum into pede plano. Remark also pedimus for pedibus in Acta Perpetuae, c. xi. (Cod. Casinensis).

³ We may compare an error in the first chapter of Matthew (i. 5) in Cod. k, which is held to contain an African text: here *Rachab* is written *Pacham*: the confusion between R and P is due to the bilingualism of the scribe: the error in the last letter is phonetic. The same thing occurs in Cod. Bezae in Matt. i. 13, where we have elicib and heliacib for eliakim.

number of cases in which there is a very decided confusion between the verb 'to be' and the verb 'to come.' For instance, in Matt. xxv. 6 the S. Germain Codex (g^1) reads

ecce sponsus est uenit,

where Wordsworth remarks "there is a two-fold rendering representing a variation in the Greek text." That is, we have a conflation of translations of two different Greek words, according to the editor of the Codex. The Greek, however, seems not to have any verb; and, if there were no other cases besides this one, we should probably be justified in regarding it as a case where the literal translation

ecce sponsus

which we find in Cod. Bezae had been filled up by two different expansions, one of which may find its motive in the following $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ of the text: e.g. Cod. b has venit, and Cod. Sangallensis has venit ($\dot{\epsilon}\rho\chi\epsilon\tau a\iota$); while the other form ecce sponsus est may still be lurking in the Old Latin versions; its existence is, however, sufficiently proved from the S. Germain text.

But there are other similar instances; in Luke xxii. 27 we have

ego autem sum in medio uestrum ueni etc.

where again we notice the double rendering; and here it seems as if the verb $\epsilon i\mu i$ really belongs to the text. If so it is curious that it should have a double rendering. Was the word $\epsilon i\mu i$ originally absent from the text? If not, how did it get changed into veni? The whole passage is in great confusion in the Bezan text.

In Acts xxi. 27 we have the Latin

qui ab Asia erant Iudaei uenerant,

which probably represents an original text

οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ᾿Ασίας Ἰουδαῖοι,

though it has been altered in the Bezan text to

οί δὲ ἀ[πὸ] τῆς ᾿Ασίας Ἰουδαῖοι ἐληλυθότες,

so as to represent the Latin more closely.

This case, then, seems to be like the first, where the missing verb had been filled up by erant and venerant in two renderings,

and the results combined. But the recurrence of the double form in the Bezan Latin makes us suspicious that something primitive is lurking here. Is it possible that we are dealing with a feature of the African Latin in such expressions as est venit, sum veni, erant venerant?

Something of a similar character comes to light when we turn to Cod. k in Mark xiii. 33,

nescitis enim quando tempus ueniet,

where d reads sit. Cod. a does not shew any verb, being thus in more close harmony with the Greek: but Codd. d k are closely related to one another and to the primitive Latin version: how are we then to explain the concurrence of sit and veniet?

In Luke vii. 12 the Codex Bezae gives

et multus populus ciuitatis cum ea erat,

and the Greek has taken on the form $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{\nu} \theta \epsilon \iota \ a \dot{\nu} \tau \hat{\eta}$ as if to answer to a Latin venerat or convenerat.

But it seems clear that the Greek text is $\mathring{\eta}\nu$, which we find in $\aleph BC\Xi$ and other MSS.: and in fact we have *erat* in the Latin of D. What are we to say to this? If there are two independent alternative translations of the Greek $\mathring{\eta}\nu$, viz. *erat* and *venerat*, how does it come to pass that traces of both of them are in the Codex Bezae, one of them in the Latin and the other by reflection in the Greek? Does it not look as if there had been a primitive rendering *erat venerat*?

In John xiii, 1 we have again a suspicious variation. Cod. Bezae reads in the Latin

quia uenerat eius hora,

and Codd. a b have uenit for uenerat.

The Greek texts divide over $\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\eta}\lambda\nu\theta\epsilon\nu$, but the Greek text of Cod. Bezae offers us a reading $\pi a\rho\hat{\eta}\nu$, which is its own invention and therefore probably comes from its Latin. The word is a very good representation of the meaning, but it is suspicious that an attempt should have been made to introduce a verb which was a compound of $\epsilon l\mu l$.

Now turn to Acts xvii. 6

OTI OI THN ΟΙΚΟΥΜΈΝΗΝ ΑΝΑСΤΑΤϢCANTEC ΟΥΤΟΙ ΕΊCIN ΚΑΙ ΕΝθάδε ΠαρείζιΝ QVIA QVI ORBEM TERRAE INQVITAVERVNT HI SVNT ET HOC VENERVNT.

The word $\epsilon i\sigma i\nu$ in the Greek is, of course, intrusive and comes from the Latin; and then the question arises as to the insertion of *sunt*. We may, perhaps, say that it was because the translator misunderstood the force of the strong $\kappa a i$ in the Greek, and therefore supposed a verb to be required with hi. The explanation may be sufficient, but it is curious that we have the collocation of the same two verbs as before. Is it not conceivable that the sentence

hi sunt et huc uenerunt,

may, after all, be good African Latin for 'are come hither also,' and not need any correction or apology?

If this explanation be correct, we can see the motive for the textual variation in six at least out of the seven cases mentioned above. We suggest, therefore, that the African Latin had a usage, not unlike that of the Syriac, of combining a verb with the auxiliary in the same tense with itself.

If this could be established, it would be natural to refer to such a form of speech for the origin of the French and Italian use of the auxiliary sum with venio, as in je suis venu etc., which form is, I believe, generally explained by Romance philologers by a reference to the Latin ventum est.

CHAPTER XXVII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE GLOSSES IN LUKE.

WE may now fairly claim to have proved our theory of Latinization as regards the Western text of the New Testament; for the Greek text of Codex Bezae has been shewn to involve a series of re-translations from the Latin, and many of the added glosses are due to second century hands, which tampered with the text in the interests of elucidation and edification.

Of the books of the New Testament which have undergone revision in this way, the two which have suffered the most are the Gospel of Luke and the Acts: in the Gospel the later chapters have suffered most from the interpolator and the commentator.

In reference to the Acts we have already given the solution with sufficient detail, and there are not many interpolations or readings left unexplained. But with the Gospel the problem is more obscure; and the resolution of the difficulties is, as we intimated in a previous chapter, a harder piece of critical work. We shall however conclude our discussion by examining a single page of the Gospel of Luke in Codex Bezae, a page which is as full of errors and corruptions as any in the whole of the Gospel.

Turn, then, to fol. 279 b and fol. 280 a of the Ms., which give respectively the Greek and Latin which stand on the 257th page of Scrivener's edition, and contain the text of Luke from c. xxiii. v. 34 to v. 45. The text of this page, judged by any imagined standard, is in great confusion. But taking our Ariadne's thread, the proved Latinization of notable passages in the Western text, we see at once how to remove a number of errors.

For example, in v. 35 $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ was rendered somewhat thinly by

the Latin videns: so the reviser corrected the Greek back to $\delta\rho\hat{\omega}\nu$, which was the exact equivalent of the Latin. Hence we have

KAI EICTHKEI Ο ΆΔΟC ΟΡώΝ ET STABAT POPVLVS VIDENS.

Again in v. 36: the translator rendered the aorist $\partial v \not\in \pi a \iota \xi a v$ by the Latin imperfect *deludebant*, and the reviser who harmonized the text and the translation gives us accordingly an imperfect in the Greek,

ENEMEZON $\Delta \varepsilon$ AYTW KAI OI CTPATIWTAI DELVDEBANT AVTEM EVM ET MILITES.

In v. 38 the abrupt Greek ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὖτος was rendered rex iudaeorum hic est: and the added verb of the Latin was restored on the Greek side.

When the translator has varied the order in a construction made up out of a participle and verb, as he often does, and naturally enough, the reviser accommodates the Greek to the rendering: so we find in v. 34

διαμεριζόμενοι δε τὰ ίμάτια αὐτοῦ έβαλον κλήρους

is rendered by

partiebantur autem uestimenta eius mittentes sortem, and the Greek finally becomes

διεμερίζοντο...βαλόντες (? βάλλοντες).

So in v. 40

ἐπιτιμῶν...ἔφη becomes increpabat...dicens,

and the final Greek is

έπετίμα...λέγων.

These instances will shew that the same general influences are at work on the text at this point as we have detected elsewhere. Now let us turn to errors of a more pronounced kind: vv. 43, 44 read in our text as follows:

και στραφείς προς τον κν είπεν αγτω μνης μνης εν τη ημέρα της ελέγςεως σογ αποκρίθεις δε ο ις είπεν αγτω τω επλης οντί θαρς εί σημέρον μετ έμος ές τω παραδείς ω

ET CONVERSVS

AD DOM DIXIT ILLI MEMENTO ME
IN DIE ADVENTVS TVI
RESPONDENS AVTEM IHS DIXIT QVI OBIVRGABAT EV
ANIMEQVIOR ESTO HODIE MECVM ERIS
IN PARADISO.

The first thing we notice is that the peculiar $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon$ has no attestation whatever except in one of the recensions of the Acta Pilati (B, c. x.), which gives the singular paraphrase

καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγει αὐτ $\hat{\varphi}$ · κύριε, ὅταν βασιλεύσης, μή μου ἐπιλάθου.

Now let us look at the perplexing addition

τω επληςοντι.

The Latin rendering shews that this stands for

τω επιπλης σοντί,

and that as it stands it means 'the one who rebuked him,' i.e. the robber who rebuked the other robber. Now if we look closely at our text we shall see that this gloss has got into the text at the wrong spot: for there is no difficulty at this place in knowing which robber is in question; and we are inclined to believe that a displacement has occurred and that the original gloss was

ille qui obiurgabat eum,

and was meant to stand two lines higher up: but only the ille got into the text at this place where it was promptly changed into illi and a corresponding $a\vec{v}\tau\hat{\varphi}$ was added in the Greek. We see then that qui obiurgabut eum was not meant for a dative as the Greek has taken it, and the gloss must have arisen on the Latin side. We see this, further, from the fact that obiurgabut is evidently the equivalent for the $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \iota \mu$ of v. 40, so that if the Greek had been the first form we should have had $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \iota \mu \eta \sigma \sigma v \tau \iota$ and not $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma v \tau \iota$. It follows, then, that obiurgabut must have been the primitive Latin rendering in v. 40, and not increpabut which the Codex Bezae now shews. This is verified by turning to the Codex Vercellensis which has actually preserved the obiurgabut. So far, then, everything is clear: we are dealing with a misplaced

marginal Latin gloss which stood primitively in the margin as

ille qui obiurgabat eum,

and which finally broke into two, and got into two separate places in the text.

Now let us turn to the *Acta Pilati*: and here we find that several of the chief authorities for the text in recension A read

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἐπιτίμησας τὸν ἔτερον αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰησοῦ· μνήσθητί μου κτέ.

Here then we have the very same gloss occurring at the place where our analysis shewed that it was meant to stand in Codex Bezae. But if this be the case, there is certainly some connection between the two texts. Nor does it seem perfectly clear that the Acta Pilati took it from a Western bilingual, for, as we see, the Latin gloss is in the Codex Bezae both wrongly inserted and wrongly translated. We should prefer to believe, if the position were tenable, that the gloss in the early Western text at this point is due to one of the sources of the Acta Pilati; but the matter is very obscure.

Now let us turn back to v. 37,

λεγοντές · χαίρε ο Βασίλεγς των ιογδαίων περιτεθέντες αγτω και ακανθίνον στεφανόν

DICENTES HABE REX IVDAEORVM INPONENTES ILLI ET DE SPINIS CORONAM.

Not a word of this is genuine, except the introductory λέγοντες! Scrivener's remark upon this verse is as follows: "very much out of place, since the scene of this act of mockery, as assigned by the other three evangelists, is Pilate's Praetorium." No doubt it is very much out of place, but then there was a reason for it. The Acta Pilati do not refer to the scene in the soldiers' hall, but place the Coronation with thorns at the time of the Crucifixion. Accordingly the text of Tischendorf's first recension is as follows:

C. X. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκ τοῦ πραιτωρίου καὶ οἱ δύο κακοῦργοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ ὅτε ἀπῆλθαν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱματία αὐτοῦ καὶ περιέζωσαν αὐτὸν λέντιον καὶ στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ περὶ τὴν κεφαλήν.

It will be seen that the *Acta Pilati* definitely assign the proceedings on the part of the soldiers to the place and time of the Crucifixion, exactly as is done in the Bezan text.

Our readers will see how interesting and how difficult the discrimination of the sources here becomes. We might, of course, simply affirm that the *Acta Pilati* had borrowed from a Western copy of the Gospels: but this hardly seems adequate, for what motive can we assign for such a displacement in the Western text of the Gospel, unless perhaps it be found in the fact that no mention was made in Luke of the Crowning? Moreover we find in the same error with the Codex Bezae two other important authorities, viz. Cod. c and the Curetonian Syriac, for Cod. c reads

aue rex iudaeorum salua temetipsum imposuerunt autem et de spinis coronam,

and the Cureton text answers to

χαῖρ ϵ · ϵ ỉ σὰ ϵ ἷ ὁ βασιλεὰς τῶν Ἰουδαίων σῶσον σεαυτόν. καὶ περιέθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν.

It is clear then that the Western error in question is very ancient: nor is it easy to see from what early document these primitive Western texts could have derived their accretion. The presumption is that the source is Latin, but this carries us only a little way. But perhaps we ought not to expect to solve all these problems at the first statement; and if we have been successful, as we hope we have, in removing in our earlier pages many difficulties from the textual criticism of the New Testament, we may reasonably ask for longer time to discuss questions that resist resolution.

Claudite iam riuos, pueri: sat prata biberunt.











